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THE 1974 DALLAS AREA CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLAN

The 1974 Annual Dallas Area Criminal Justice Plan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Texas Criminal Justice Council. The plan represents the combined best judgment of every local criminal justice agency in Dallas County as presenting a balanced program for the reduction of crime and delinquency. Efforts projected represent a balance among the criminal justice agencies, the representative criminal justice functions of law enforcement, adjudication and corrections, and also a balance between the annual Texas Criminal Justice Plan and the Dallas Impact Plan.

The problems associated with crime have caused major concern in Dallas. This concern is represented by an increasingly crime conscious public and by determined, dedicated efforts on the part of all criminal justice officials. The Dallas area, in recognizing the concern about problems of crime and delinquency, has been able to develop a two-pronged attack. The first has been an organized effort at reducing all crime problems with state and federal assistance through the Texas Criminal Justice Council annual grant program. The second major focus of the Dallas area attack on crime is the Dallas Impact Program. The Impact Program represents a concerted effort to reduce the stranger-to-stranger crimes of murder, rape, robbery, correlated assaults and burglary.

The Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council has mobilized the resources of the County of Dallas, the City of Dallas, and the Dallas suburban cities in developing a county-wide crime reduction program. Through the Council staff, every local governmental agency has been afforded the opportunity to participate in the development of the Texas Criminal Justice Plan. Each has been requested to present an organized analysis of the problems of crime and delinquency and to project needed financial resources in responding to the problems which are identified.

The City and County of Dallas have also directly participated in the development of the Impact Plan. Resources of each criminal justice agency have been organized to produce a complete analysis of crime problems relating to the stranger-to-stranger crimes of murder, robbery, rape, correlated assaults, and burglary. The criminal justice agencies have been the primary source of information and have responded in a manner which exhibits dedication to the ultimate goal of reducing crime in Dallas.

Crime Highlights

Total Index crime in Dallas County increased from 55,546 crimes in 1971 to 56,228 crimes in 1972. This, however, represents a decrease in the rate per 100,000 population from 4,185 to 4,022. Within Dallas County, 80.40 percent of the crime occurs in the City of Dallas. During the corresponding time period Index crimes in Dallas decreased from 46,400 in 1971 to 45,213 in 1972 representing a decrease in the rate per 100,000 population from 5,495 to 5,149. The factors which can be attributed to this trend are as diversified as the criminal justice system itself and the people which the system serves. No single agency or factor can properly receive total credit. It is appropriate, however, that the prevailing spirit of purpose that unifies the criminal justice system in Dallas County can be applauded for the collective contributions.

The dedicated efforts which contributed to the current declining crime rate must continue if the trend is to be long lived. The crime of burglary continues to menace the Dallas area criminal justice system. While all other Index crimes showed a decrease from 1971 to 1972, the crime of burglary increased by 17.21 percent. Also, while crime in Dallas County has declined in the past year, the rates of crime remain the highest in Texas and indeed higher than the crime rates in Houston, Ft. Worth and San Antonio and the State of Texas as a whole. The violent nature of crimes committed also continues to increase in Dallas especially when stranger-to-stranger crimes are considered.
Plan Highlights

The total resources of the criminal justice system must be applied if meaningful accomplishments are to be realized in reducing crime. This plan thus represents a balanced effort toward reducing crime. The projected resource needs as applied toward the total criminal justice system reflect the following major areas of emphasis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Texas Plan</th>
<th>Impact Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Crime and Delinquency</td>
<td>$129,589</td>
<td>$1,090,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Drug Related Crime</td>
<td>120,958</td>
<td>632,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>4,213,329</td>
<td>3,346,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>1,641,430</td>
<td>1,608,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>574,914</td>
<td>2,111,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projects reflected in the 1974 Dallas Area Criminal Justice Plan have been considered on the basis of the overall problems of crime and delinquency, economic feasibility, legal feasibility, administrative feasibility and the expected benefit to the entire criminal justice system. It is recognized that conditions within the system are constantly changing, as are crime trends and patterns. This plan was prepared during the time when major changes in state law were being enacted by the Texas Legislature. Although it is too soon to anticipate the effects of the new laws, those which represent the greatest concern are:

The Texas Penal Code
The Texas Juvenile Code
The Texas Control Substance Act (Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs)
The Act Authorizing the Establishment of Judicial District Personal Bond Offices
The Bail Reform Act (Regulation of Bail Bonds in counties over 150,000 population)

The Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council recognizes the potential effects of these new laws as they relate to the workload placed upon the criminal courts, both County and District, the Adult Probation Department, the Juvenile Probation Department, the law enforcement agencies and the corrections facilities. During the coming year the Council will be addressing its attention to the effects of the new laws and their relationship to the criminal justice planning program. An objective of the planning process has been to build in an inherent flexibility into the plan, therefore enabling appropriate adjustments to be made based upon justifiable needs.

The challenge to the Dallas area criminal justice system is to implement this plan and its projected programs so as to reflect ultimate benefits to all citizens of the area as they are affected by crime. The ultimate goals of crime reduction can, however, only be accomplished if everyone concerned exerts a conscious effort in this regard.
I. DALLAS AREA CHARACTERISTICS
I. DALLAS AREA CHARACTERISTICS

A. DALLAS COUNTY

The vigorous and explosive growth of the Dallas area within the last decade has an unmistakable influence upon every plan proposed for future action within Dallas County. During the last ten years Dallas County experienced a significant population increase of 39.5 percent. Migration to the Dallas area accounted for most of this population increase.

Within the geographic boundaries of Dallas County there are 28 incorporated municipalities. The last census recorded 1,327,321 persons residing within the 893 square miles of Dallas County. Blacks comprise 17 percent of the County's total population, while 7 percent of the population is Mexican-American. Contrary to the substantial increase of minority population in the central city, numerically there were no major ethnic shifts in the remainder of Dallas County during the last decade. The ratio of whites to the total population in Dallas County suburban cities increased, the percentage of other races increased, and the ratio of blacks decreased during the 1960's.

The largest gains in non-white population among the suburban cities were recorded by Garland and Irving, whose 1970 ratios of blacks to whites were one out of 27 and one out of 104 respectively. Irving's increase in black population was the most spectacular increase percentage-wise. The Bureau of Census indicates that one out of 78 residents of Highland Park is black, while one out of 2,300 in Mesquite is black. In Duncanville, one out of 7,050 residents is non-white. Table I-1 displays the population characteristics of cities over 5,000 in Dallas County. This data was compiled from 1970 census tract information.

Table I-2 indicates the distribution of male and female population by age in the City of Dallas and the surrounding suburbs within the geographical boundaries of Dallas County. This data indicates that the median age in the City of Dallas is 29 for males and 30 for females. In Dallas County, the median age for both sexes is 28. The higher birth rate of the 1940's and 1950's and age progression are beginning to make Dallas County a less youth-oriented area. With the continuation of this trend we can expect a greater proportion of the total population to be 35 by the 1980 census.

The City of Dallas' Department of Planning and Urban Development projects that, given the current growth trend of the county, Dallas County can reasonably expect the population to reach 1,781,000 by 1980. The population of the City of Dallas is projected to exceed one million by 1980.

As illustrated by Table I-3, median family income for Dallas County is $10,680. In sharp contrast to this figure, the median family income of $6,281 for black families is considerably lower than for the average family unit in Dallas County. Furthermore, the Office of the Governor reports that 27,558 families in Dallas County are below the poverty level as defined by the U. S. Bureau of Census. Whites represent 55 percent of all families in Dallas County below the poverty level, and 23 percent of all blacks residing in Dallas County are below the poverty level.

Occupations in Dallas County are widely diversified, as exemplified in Table I-4. Sixty-four percent of all blacks are employed as semi-skilled laborers, while only 29 percent of whites work in the same occupational category. Unemployment among minority groups appears to run consistently higher than average unemployment for the area. For example, the unemployment rate of the United States as a whole in 1970 was 4.9 percent but non-white unemployment was 8.2 percent. In Dallas, unemployment in 1970 was 3 percent, but non-white unemployment was 5 percent. A comparison of unemployment rates shows that Dallas' non-white unemployment is more than double the rate of white unemployment. The 5 percent level of black unemployment, however, is still much lower than the national average of 8.2 percent.

Dallas County residents record 12 years of education as the median years of school completed by both male and female residents. Opportunities for education beyond the high school level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dallas County</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American*</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>1,327,321</td>
<td>1,096,236</td>
<td>220,512</td>
<td>88,652</td>
<td>4,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balch Springs</td>
<td>10,464</td>
<td>10,414</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>13,855</td>
<td>13,402</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>844,401</td>
<td>626,247</td>
<td>210,238</td>
<td>67,902</td>
<td>3,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>6,617</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncanville</td>
<td>14,105</td>
<td>14,056</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Branch</td>
<td>27,492</td>
<td>27,271</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>81,437</td>
<td>78,095</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>50,904</td>
<td>46,629</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>10,133</td>
<td>9,979</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>97,260</td>
<td>95,805</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>10,522</td>
<td>10,101</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite</td>
<td>55,131</td>
<td>54,818</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>48,582</td>
<td>48,389</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>23,498</td>
<td>23,213</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No separate category for Mexican-American was included in the 1970 census; therefore, data represented here is included under the “white” population. This category consists of total of individuals identified as “Persons of Spanish Language,” and “Other Persons of Spanish Surnames.”

SOURCE: Dallas Chamber of Commerce
TABLE 1-2
Population Racial Characteristics by Age for Dallas City and County — 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Races</th>
<th>Dallas City</th>
<th>% Dallas City</th>
<th>Dallas County</th>
<th>% Dallas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Races</td>
<td>844,401</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,327,321</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>626,146</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>1,096,135</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>210,342</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>220,616</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MALE POPULATION — BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGES</th>
<th>Dallas City</th>
<th>Dallas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>403,014</td>
<td>640,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>39,528</td>
<td>65,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>16,732</td>
<td>28,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>25,487</td>
<td>43,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>33,330</td>
<td>56,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8,066</td>
<td>13,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,702</td>
<td>12,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>14,956</td>
<td>23,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>12,677</td>
<td>19,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,070</td>
<td>9,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>21,903</td>
<td>32,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>59,843</td>
<td>100,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>47,168</td>
<td>79,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>45,591</td>
<td>68,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>17,903</td>
<td>25,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-61</td>
<td>6,382</td>
<td>8,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-64</td>
<td>8,166</td>
<td>11,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>17,486</td>
<td>23,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-over</td>
<td>8,024</td>
<td>10,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Dallas Chamber of Commerce

FEMALE POPULATION — BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGES</th>
<th>Dallas City</th>
<th>Dallas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>441,387</td>
<td>686,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>37,955</td>
<td>62,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>16,052</td>
<td>27,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>24,777</td>
<td>41,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>32,594</td>
<td>54,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>12,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,723</td>
<td>12,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>15,013</td>
<td>23,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>14,495</td>
<td>22,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8,169</td>
<td>12,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>26,976</td>
<td>40,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>60,542</td>
<td>103,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>51,036</td>
<td>82,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>50,111</td>
<td>72,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>20,940</td>
<td>28,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-61</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>10,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-64</td>
<td>10,079</td>
<td>15,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>25,458</td>
<td>33,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-over</td>
<td>15,322</td>
<td>20,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Dallas Chamber of Commerce
### TABLE I-3
Dallas County Income by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE AND OTHERS*</th>
<th>MEXICAN-AMERICAN**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1,000</td>
<td>23,693</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,999</td>
<td>24,774</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,999</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 to $3,999</td>
<td>23,343</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000 to $5,999</td>
<td>52,421</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12,354</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>109,815</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16,542</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>105,410</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 or More</td>
<td>91,899</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Family Income**
- $10,680
- $6,281
- $11,436
- $8,551

**Median Per Capita Income**
- $3,312
- $2,131
- $3,667
- $2,599

*White and Other is defined as total Dallas County population less Black population. This group includes those tabulated as Mexican-American Indian, etc.

**No separate category was included for Mexican-American. Data represented in this category consists of individuals identified as "persons of Spanish language," and "other persons of Spanish surnames."

**SOURCE:** *Selected Demographic Characteristics from Census Data — Fourth Count, Office of the Governor — Office of Information Services.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations:</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Black Number</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>White and Others Number</th>
<th>White and Others Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical</td>
<td>89,876</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>84,236</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Administrators</td>
<td>56,025</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>54,237</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Sales</td>
<td>182,566</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>12,822</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>169,744</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and Foremen</td>
<td>73,221</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>65,867</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>171,390</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>57,138</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>114,252</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Workers</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Unemployed</td>
<td>16,533</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4,052</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>12,481</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>591,369</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>89,380</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>501,989</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have increased rapidly in the last 20 years. Twenty-two degree-granting colleges, universities, and professional schools are located in the Dallas Standard Metropolitan Area. Among the principal institutions in Dallas County are Southern Methodist University; the Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas; Baylor University College of Dentistry; University of Dallas; Bishop College; Dallas Theological Seminary; University of Texas at Dallas; and Dallas County Community College District. The Dallas County Community College District represents a strong new factor in Dallas' educational resources. The system has a master plan for seven community colleges to be located throughout the county.

The new Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport facility is scheduled to open in October. This 17,000-acre airport will be the world's largest international air transport facility. With the anticipated large influx of passengers and jobs to the Dallas area, security and public safety have become a major concern.

A description of demographic data for cities interested in participating in the programs of the Texas Criminal Justice Council follows. These include Dallas, Garland, Grand Prairie and Mesquite.

B. CITY OF DALLAS

The City of Dallas occupies 297 square miles in the center of Dallas County and is currently the second most populous city in Texas. Eighty percent of the Index crimes occur in Dallas, even though the population of the city comprises only 64 percent of the total population of Dallas County. Although Dallas is considered to be a relatively new city among major urban centers, its rapid growth has brought it the distinction of being the eighth largest city in the nation.

The Department of Urban Planning estimates that within the city limits there are presently 878,000 residents. This population figure represents a 4 percent increase in population since the 1970 census statistics of 844,401. Throughout the decade of the sixties the census statistics show a 24.2 percent increase in population for the city.

The Bureau of Census' 1970 count reports that the city's increase in white population lagged far behind its gain in total blacks during the last ten years — 14.2 percent compared to 62.7 percent. In contrast to the trend in the remainder of the county, the central city experienced a dramatic increase in black population during the last decade, as whites accounted for a decreasing percentage of the total city's population. Whites, in relation to the total population, dropped from 81 percent in 1960 to 74 percent in 1970, while blacks showed a corresponding increase from 19 percent to 25 percent of the total population. Thus, whites and Mexican-Americans comprise 74 percent of Dallas' population. Blacks contribute 25 percent to the composition of the population, while 1 percent of the city's inhabitants are other races (Indian and Orientals).

The 1970 Census confirmed the fact that Dallas' principal growth thrust continues northward. The central city's northward growth spills over its corporate boundaries into other municipalities on the north side of Dallas County — Irving, Carrollton, Farmers Branch, Garland, and Mesquite.

From its beginning Dallas has been a marketing center and although trade is at the core of the economy, Dallas maintains a highly diversified economy. No one segment of the employment market dominates the city. An analysis of the non-agricultural employment in Dallas indicates:

17.9 percent of total employment is in retail trade; 9.6 percent is in wholesale trade; 8.3 percent is in banking, finance, real estate, and insurance; 6.1 percent is in contract construction; 5.7 percent is in transportation and utilities; 8.3 percent is in business and personal services; 11.0 percent is in government; 7.9 percent is in medical and professional services; and 20.3 percent is in manufacturing. Mean family income for the city of Dallas is estimated at $11,528.
Although the unemployment rate for Dallas is consistently lower than the state or national rate, Dallas experienced a 3 percent rate of unemployment in 1972. The rate of minority unemployment exceeds the rate of white unemployment. Much of the unemployment in Dallas can be attributed to a shift away from unskilled jobs, resulting in fewer blue-collar jobs. Expanding Dallas employment opportunities have been primarily in occupations requiring long periods of education and training. It is expected that this trend will continue, providing little growth in the semi-skilled and unskilled occupations.

A correlation can be drawn between education and unemployment in Dallas. A city survey shows the median education level in low income areas of Dallas to be 10.5 years. The survey showed, however, that 65 percent of low income residents over 25 years of age had not completed high school. Figure I-1 displays a comparison of education for the entire city by race and sex. The median years of school completed by both males and females in the city is 11.9. More white men complete their education in college than do blacks. Sixty percent of the black men in the city completed their education either while in high school or immediately afterwards. The Dallas Independent School District is currently conducting a program of continuing education for the purpose of upgrading academic and vocational education in the city.

The City of Dallas has traditionally played a dominant role in housing the people living in metropolitan Dallas. While affluence is conspicuous in Dallas, the city still has its share of residential slums and sections in varying stages of decline. Between 1960 and 1970 many fundamental changes occurred in the housing patterns of the City of Dallas. The number of dwelling units increased at a higher rate than the population within Dallas during the last decade. The majority of the recent growth has been in apartments. During the sixties multiple units increased by 55,610 or a growth rate of 99 percent, compared with the addition of 14,604 single family units or a 14 percent increase recorded over the same period.

The shift from homeownership to apartment living is recorded in the decrease of owner-occupied residential units from more than 55 percent of the city's total units in 1960 to only 49 percent in 1970. In the next decade Dallas could conceivably exhaust its remaining vacant land available for single-family home construction. The result might be even more dependence on apartment housing. The Dallas Police Department maintains that the increase in apartment housing has contributed substantially to the increase in burglary. Burglary is the most frequently occurring crime in the city, with over 40 percent of all burglaries occurring in apartments.
FIG. I-1
Comparison of Education by Race and Sex in Dallas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 or less</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Non-White

Source: City of Dallas Department of Urban Development
The City of Garland is incorporated within a 55 square mile area, 14 miles northeast of downtown Dallas. Within the geographical boundaries of Garland, 102,078 persons reside. In 1970 the Bureau of Census reported 94 percent of the city's population as white. Blacks contributed 4 percent to the total racial composition of the population, while Mexican-Americans constituted an additional 4 percent of the population. The remaining 1 percent of the populace is composed of other races, Orientals, and American Indians. Females comprise 52 percent of the population in the City of Garland.

Most of the population reside in single family dwelling units with a density of about 3.5 units per acre. A preliminary identification of crime problems in Garland indicated that burglary in residential areas accounts for a vast majority of the city's crime problem. Approximately 85 percent of Garland's current population (1972) own their own homes. This fact points to the relative stability of the population as a whole. However, the fact that only 27 percent of the city's 1970 population of 81,437 was 35 years of age and over, and 50 percent were 21 years of age and under, indicates that the population mobility tendencies of the Garland community are potentially quite high. Requests for multi-family units are increasing. Consequently, Planned Unit Development (PUD), cluster development, town houses, patio houses, and condominiums will be the housing forms requested in the future.

Growth in Garland has generally been confined to the Duck Creek drainage basin where sanitary sewers exist. Immediate growth and additional population in Garland will fill the Duck Creek basin. Later growth will extend beyond this watershed area into the Rowlett Creek Basin. The next distribution of Garland's population will be basically in a north-south direction. Until the North Outer Loop is constructed the major growth should occur between Centerville Road and Interstate 30. Completion of Interstate 635, Interstate 30, and the purchase of land by the City of Dallas for the development of Lake Ray Hubbard are three major growth barriers surrounding the entire lower half of the city. The older areas of the city, located geographically between Walnut Street and Forest Lane, are in a transition zone and have experienced mixed land use. As a whole Garland has only two blighted areas, both of which are located in the northeast part of the city.

Garland has several industrial districts. Companies located within these districts include Continental Steel, Dearborn Stove, General Telephone, Kraft Foods, Oilwell (division of U. S. Steel), Varo, Inc., and Safeway Foods Distribution Center, which employ a total of approximately 16,000 people. Median family income for the city is $11,249. Despite the relatively high median family income, approximately 680 families or 3 percent of the population are considered below the poverty level.

Presently, there are 37 schools in the Garland Independent School District, including 26 elementary, eight junior high, and three high schools, with a total enrollment of 23,900 students. City medical care facilities include the Garland Clinic and Hospital and Garland Memorial Hospital, which provide a total of 350 beds. There are 80 churches in Garland, representing virtually every denomination.

The City Parks and Recreation Department operates 35 parks with facilities that include ball fields, four swimming pools, a tennis center, and playground and picnic areas. Lake Lavon and Lake Ray Hubbard provide facilities for fishing, swimming, boating and picnicking.

D. CITY OF GRAND PRAIRIE

Grand Prairie, a city of an estimated 55,000 population, is located halfway between Dallas and Fort Worth. The city occupies 79.6 square miles and is situated in both Dallas and Tarrant Counties.
Approximately 15 percent of the city's current population is minority—8 percent black and 7 percent Mexican-American. Grand Prairie's median income for 1970 was $10,250, with a mean income of $11,260. Black median income, however, was $5,080.

In the northwest, west, and southwest sections of the city lies the Great Southwest Industrial District. Grand Prairie constitutes the hub of this industrial area with over 58 percent of the site located within the city limits. The 6,800 acres of the Great Southwest Industrial District houses over 400 companies.

Homebuilding is one of the city's leading businesses. Construction records continue to spiral annually. In addition to homebuilding, aerospace, air craft, mobile homes, printing, furniture, clothing, concrete pipe, food processing, and electronics are among the other leading industries of Grand Prairie.

Grand Prairie is also growing into a tourist center with the recent addition of Lion Country Safari and the Southwestern Historical Wax Museum.

Two excellent school systems currently serve the City of Grand Prairie.

E. CITY OF MESQUITE

Mesquite is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of Dallas, and is one of 60 separate municipalities in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area. The city encompasses 27.81 square miles and has another 17.74 square miles within its extra territorial jurisdiction for future expansion.

At one time Mesquite was a separate, small community, but because of the urban growth of the Dallas area, it is now a suburb of the larger city. As the result of emigration from the City of Dallas and other areas of Texas, the population of Mesquite has grown rapidly over the past 20 years. The population expanded from 1,696 in 1950 to 27,526 in 1960 and continued to increase to 55,131 in 1970. In 1973 the population is estimated to be 65,200. The effect of emigration is illustrated by the fact that only 16 percent of Mesquite's population in 1969 was actually born in the city. This characteristic of the population has continued to be prevalent, in part, due to the major highway system which runs through Mesquite. Interstate Highway 20 (U.S. 80), Interstate Highway 30 (U.S. 67) and Interstate Highway 635 (L.B.J. Freeway) continue to provide a major stimulus for the city as a place of commuter residents.

Approximately 95 percent of Mesquite households are families, with the average family size being 3.72 persons. In 1969 almost 20 percent of all households contained five persons, while nearly one-third had five persons or more. Only a small minority of the city's 13,864 families do not have children living at home. Since 44 percent of the 1970 population in Mesquite was under 18, the homogeneity of Mesquite households, typically families with school age children, is quite obvious.

Approximately 28.3 percent of the population of Mesquite is in the age group of five to fourteen years old. The median age of the entire Mesquite population in 1969 was 20.4 years. This compares to the United States average of 28.8 years to indicate that Mesquite has a very young population.

Mesquite's minority population in 1970 totaled 2,607 persons, 4.7 percent of the total population. Only 24 persons of this minority population were black. Other minority groups included: Oriental, 137; American Indian, 152; and Spanish surname, 2,294.

The majority of persons now residing in Mesquite have moved from Dallas, although a fairly substantial percentage immigrated from other areas of Texas and from other states. Only 17.6 percent of the 1969 population moved into the city before 1960, and 16 percent of the persons were born in Mesquite. The average resident has lived in Mesquite about five years.
The fact that only 16.7 percent of Mesquite's total labor force works in Mesquite indicates that it is largely a commuter-type city. Although this indicates that Mesquite is a "bedroom community," the number of industrially related jobs in the city has grown from 500 in 1968 to 3,056 in 1972. One-half of those employed in Mesquite, however, are local residents. Most residents of Mesquite are employed in Dallas, Garland, and Richardson. Wholesale and retail trade employed about one-fourth of the labor force in 1970, while manufacturing and processing employed one-third. Occupationally, there has been a shift from the operative and semi-skilled to the craftsman and skilled persons.

The median family income in Mesquite is $10,983 and the mean income is $11,450. Average family income is quite high in spite of the fact that there is a fairly small proportion of professional and related type persons residing in the city. The fairly high median income is accounted for by the high proportion of skilled craftsmen who command a good yearly income, especially with the availability of a substantial amount of overtime work. There are few low income families, with approximately 4.1 percent earning at or below poverty level.

The proportion of the population that has attained at least a high school education stands at 55.9 percent of all persons over 25 years of age. The median school years completed is 12.2. A separate analysis of education of Mesquite residents by the year they moved to Mesquite shows that the amount of education of the immigrants has been substantially higher for each successive wave of migration.
II. CRIME AND DELINQUENCY PROBLEMS
II. CRIME AND DELINQUENCY PROBLEMS

1972 crime in Dallas County is presented in this chapter in statistical and analytical detail.

In gathering the essential data for this chapter, the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council (DACJC) provided each city within the county with the 1974 Texas Criminal Justice Council Action Grant Policies and Procedures Guide in order that each agency could respond according to their plans regarding 1974 funding. Four major cities responded with detailed data collection and analysis - Dallas, Garland, Grand Prairie, and Mesquite. An additional twelve cities provided their 1972 annual data for the cooperative purposes of assisting the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council to depict the total crime situation for Dallas County.

The assistance of each agency listed in this chapter has been invaluable to the preparation of this plan and their cooperation is acknowledged with gratitude.

A. GENERAL CONDITIONS AND COMPARISONS

Based on the rate per 100,000 population, crime in Dallas County decreased by 163.94 during 1972 (Table II-1). The factors attributable to this favorable trend are as diversified as the elements that comprise the criminal justice system, the people who are employed throughout its agencies, and all the people it serves. No one agency or factor can properly receive total credit for this decline. It is appropriate, however, that the prevailing spirit of purpose that unifies the criminal justice system within Dallas County be applauded for its collective contributions during the past year.

Dallas County, however, must be conscious of the need to continue the trend established. Table II-1 reveals a decrease in the crime rate; it also shows, however, that 56,228 Index crimes occurred during 1972, which is the greatest number of Index crimes ever recorded in Dallas County. With the predicted continued increases in population (1.8 million by 1980), the need for a planned, mapped strategy that includes input from every element of the Dallas criminal justice system is imperative.

Of the 16 major cities within Dallas County which comprise approximately 99 percent of the total population in this area, 80.4 percent of the total crime occurs within the City of Dallas (Table II-2). While the crime for each city within the county will be presented individually later in this section, it is important to note at this point that the 45,213 incidences of Index crimes in the city represent a decrease of 1,187 Index crimes compared to 1971. It can be deducted then that the county increase of 882 incidents of crime as shown in Table II-1 reveals that this increase took place in the suburbs.

The most frequently occurring crime in the county is burglary. Table II-3 lists the 1972 Index crimes by type and shows that 25,419 burglaries were recorded during 1972. This is an average of one burglary in the county every 34½ minutes. The crime of theft over $50 also occurs at a very high rate.

It should be noted that Dallas has been designated by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) as one of eight cities in the nation to receive a $20 million grant to reduce the stranger-to-stranger crimes of murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault and burglary. This three-year program is approaching its second year of funding. While it is not possible to identify the stranger-to-stranger offenses in Table II-3, the total incidences of rape, murder, robbery, aggravated assault, and burglary represent approximately 61 percent of the total Index crimes.
TABLE II-I

1971 - 1972 Comparison
of Dallas County Index Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Index Crimes</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>55,546</td>
<td>4,185.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>56,228</td>
<td>4,021.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (+, -)</td>
<td>+ 682</td>
<td>- 163.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Population:
1971: 1,327,036
1972: 1,398,094

Source: Dallas County Police Agencies
TABLE II-2

1972 Dallas County Index Crime
Rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1972 Estimated Population</th>
<th>1972 Total Index Crime</th>
<th>Percent of Total Crime</th>
<th>Rate Per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>878,000</td>
<td>45,213</td>
<td>80.41</td>
<td>5,149.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3,192.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3,023.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchins</td>
<td>1,755*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2,784.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>107,350</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2,550.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagoville</td>
<td>4,390*</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2,437.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>102,078</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2,129.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite</td>
<td>63,556</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2,108.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>6,617*</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2,069.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockrell Hill</td>
<td>3,515*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1,676.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>10,133*</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1,569.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1,443.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncanville</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1,411.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1,395.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Branch</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1,347.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>938.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,398,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,228</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,022.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1970 U. S. Census

Source: Dallas County Police Agencies
TABLE II-3

1972 Dallas County
Index Crime by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Rate Per 100,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>198.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>5,409</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>386.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>25,419</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>1,818.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft over $50</td>
<td>15,336</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1,096.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>464.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1972 Index Crime</td>
<td>56,228</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,021.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 1,398,094 County Population

Source: Dallas County Police Agencies

B. CRIME IN THE CITY OF DALLAS

Table II-4 shows that a total of 45,213 Index Crimes was committed in Dallas during 1972. The number of Index crimes decreased in all categories except burglary in a comparison of 1971 and 1972. Burglary showed an increase of 3,153 offenses over the previous year. Table II-5 shows a 1971 comparison between Dallas and other large cities in the state. Overall, Dallas ranked highest in a comparison of the total crime Index rate per 100,000 for 1971. Its total rate was more than twice that of the state-wide rate for Texas (103.7 percent greater than the state rate.)

Table II-6 shows a comparison of individual 1971 Index crime rates for each of the cities listed in Table II-5. Dallas ranked first in four (rape, aggravated assault, burglary, theft over $50) of the seven Index crimes listed in the table and second in robberies, auto thefts, and murders (tied with Houston). Thus, in a comparison of 1971 rates, Dallas was either ranked first or second in all seven Index crimes.

Within the city crime occurred most frequently in the Southeast District during 1972. Table II-7 represents 1972 Index crimes by districts. Figure II-1 graphically depicts this distribution.

The following is an analysis of crime as it occurs throughout the City of Dallas:

1. MURDER

There were 192 murders committed in the city during 1972. This is an approximate 7 percent reduction compared to the 1971 total of 207. The 1972 rate per 100,000 population was 21.9. Figure II-2 indicates that the majority (44 percent) of murders were committed in the Southeast District. Murder represents .4 percent of the total Index crime in the city.
### TABLE II-4
City of Dallas Index Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>Percent of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>- 7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>- 8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>- 8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>-14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>18,322</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>+17.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft over $50</td>
<td>12,229</td>
<td>10,481</td>
<td>-14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>-22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>45,213</td>
<td>- 2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

### TABLE II-5
Comparison of 1971 Index Crime Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>5,495.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>4,771.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>4,082.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>3,544.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,697.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department, F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report

### TABLE II-6
1971 Index Crime Rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Aggravated Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Over $50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>338.8</td>
<td>625.5</td>
<td>2,169.8</td>
<td>1,448.2</td>
<td>818.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>415.8</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>2,126.7</td>
<td>891.7</td>
<td>1,035.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>319.6</td>
<td>1,681.1</td>
<td>1,224.1</td>
<td>733.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>1,617.2</td>
<td>715.6</td>
<td>727.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>1,175.0</td>
<td>781.2</td>
<td>367.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

### TABLE II-7
1972 City of Dallas Index Crime by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total 1972</th>
<th>1972 Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,053</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8,455</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>9,043</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45,213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department
FIGURE II-1
Dallas Police Department
TOTAL NUMBER OF INDEX CRIMES BY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base
FIGURE H-2
Dallas Police Department
Murder — Total 0.4% of Index Crime

Chart 3

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base 1972
Tables II-8 and II-9 list statistics that were obtained from an analysis of murders occurring between September, 1972, and March, 1973.

2. RAPE

There were 533 reported cases of rape during 1972 which was 1.2 percent of the total Index crimes in the city. This is an approximate 8.8 percent decrease compared to the 1971 total of 585. The 1972 rate per 100,000 population was 60.7. Figure II-3 indicates that 36.5 percent of the rapes were committed in the Southeast District. Table II-10 lists a victim analysis of rapes occurring in the city between September, 1972, and March, 1973.

3. ROBBERY

There were 2,616 robbery offenses during 1972 representing 5.7 percent of the total Index crimes. This is an approximate 8.5 percent reduction compared to the 1971 total. Figure II-4 shows that the majority of robberies (31.2 percent) occurred in the Southeast District. Tables II-11 and II-12 represent an analysis of the robberies that occurred in Dallas during 1972.

Fifty-seven percent of the robberies involved individuals or commercial representatives on streets, alleys, or private parking lots. Eight percent were of persons in residences, including yards. Thirty-five percent of the robberies were of commercial houses, gas stations, chain stores, and banks. Table II-13 indicates the type of weapons used in 747 robberies that occurred between October and December, 1972.

Of the 747 robberies sampled, 359 or 47.2 percent were robberies of individuals and 388 or 52.8 percent were robberies of businesses. The type of commercial establishment most

**TABLE II-8**

City of Dallas
Murder Victim Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Percent of Total Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Negro Male</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult White Male</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult White Female</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Negro Female</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Negro Male</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile White Female</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile White Male</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Negro Female</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

**TABLE II-9**

City of Dallas
Method Used in Crimes of Murder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife, Cutting or Stabbing Instrument</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

II-8
FIGURE II-3
Dallas Police Department
Rape — Total 1.2% of Index Crime

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base 1972
TABLE II-10
City of Dallas
Rape Victim Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Percent of Total Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Negro Female</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult White Female</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Negro Female</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile White Female</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department
FIGURE II-4
Dallas Police Department
Robbery — Total 5.7% of Index Crime

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base 1972
### TABLE II-11
City of Dallas
Amount of Loss in 1972 Robbery Offenses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Robberies</td>
<td>2,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Losses</td>
<td>$701,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recoveries</td>
<td>65,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Loss</td>
<td>$635,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Loss Per Robbery</td>
<td>$ 242.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

### TABLE II-12
City of Dallas
Setting of 1972 Robbery Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Place</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial House</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Station</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Store</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          | 100.0%         |

Source: Dallas Police Department
TABLE II-13
City of Dallas
Weapons Used in Robbery Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Weapon Used</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearm (hand gun)</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm (shotgun, rifle)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife, Cutting or Stabbing Instrument</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands, Fists, Feet, etc.</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosives</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Threats</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Weapons</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

often robbed was drive-in groceries with increases noted in the robbery of fast-food businesses during the warm temperature months. The gun was most often described as a small, black (blue steel) revolver.

4. AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

There were 4,529 instances of aggravated assault recorded during 1972. This represents a 14.2 percent decrease compared to the 5,282 aggravated assaults that occurred in 1971. Figure II-5 shows the distribution of aggravated assaults throughout the police districts. This graph indicates that aggravated assault accounts for 10 percent of the total Index crimes and that 38.2 percent of the aggravated assault offenses occur in the Southeast District. Table II-14 represents the percentage distribution of the methods or weapons used in aggravated assault offenses committed in 1972.

5. BURGLARY

Burglary is the single most common Index crime in Dallas, accounting for nearly half (47.5 percent) of all Index crimes in 1972. This represents a 17.2 percent increase over the number recorded for 1971. Figure II-6 depicts the distribution of the 1972 burglaries by police districts. The Southeast District recorded 29.3 percent of the total.

Statistics obtained from an analysis of crimes which occurred in Dallas between September, 1972, and March, 1973, revealed that the majority of all burglaries were realized by entry through either the front or rear door (62 percent). While most crimes were committed by a breaking or forcing of entry, 15 percent were made possible by unlocked doors or windows. Another 7 percent were aided by unlocked and open garages, and in-common
FIGURE II-5
Dallas Police Department
Aggravated Assault — 10.0% of Index Crime

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base 1972
TABLE II-14
City of Dallas
Methods or Weapons Used in 1972
Aggravated Assault Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method or Weapon</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife, Cutting Instrument</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dangerous Weapon</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands, Feet, etc.</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department
FIGURE II-6
Dallas Police Department
Burglary — Total 47.6% of Index Crime

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base 1972
basements of apartments and warehouses. Thus, nearly one-fourth of all burglaries surveyed could have been prevented or made more difficult by the increased use of locks or similar preventive measures. Table II-15 represents the points of entry utilized. Table II-16 shows a percentage distribution of methods of entry.

In addition, the following information was obtained through a review of the burglary data available:

- Forty percent of all residential burglaries are committed in apartments.
- The majority of business burglaries are committed between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m.
- The majority of residential burglaries are committed between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m.
- Type of business most often burglarized according to district:
  - Northwest — bars, warehouses, miscellaneous offices
  - Northeast — miscellaneous offices
  - Central — miscellaneous offices
  - Oak Cliff — churches, schools, service stations
  - South Dallas — bars, cafes

Table II-17 indicates the amounts of loss attributable to the various types of burglaries.

6. THEFT OVER $50

There were 10,481 crimes of theft over $50 reported during 1972, representing a decrease of 14.3 percent when compared to the 12,229 offenses reported in 1971.

Figure II-7 graphically shows that the offenses occurred on a more or less equitable basis throughout the city with the highest percentages being recorded in the Northeast and

### TABLE II-15

City of Dallas
Points of Entry in Burglaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of Entry</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Door</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Door</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Window</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Window</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Window</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Door</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/Floor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department
TABLE II-16
City of Dallas
Methods of Entry in Burglaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Entry</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prying, Breaking, Cutting, Sawing, Etc.</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlocked doors, windows</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smashed, Kicked, Struck</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Force (sneaked)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key, Combination Lock</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosion, Arson, Cutting Torch</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

TABLE II-17
City of Dallas
Losses Attributed to 1972 Burglaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Value of Property Stolen</th>
<th>Value of Property Recovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>$1,159,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>$1,516,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>$626,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15,058</td>
<td>$3,301,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td>$1,519,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>$1,132,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>$583,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>$2,235,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>$5,537,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70.1% Residence
29.9% Business

A loss of $862.88 per burglary (total loss minus total recovery).

Residence — Average $200.63 per burglary
Nonresidence — Average $306.32 per burglary

Source: Dallas Police Department
FIGURE 17
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Theft Over $50 — Total 23.1% of Index Crime

Source: Dallas Police Department Automatic Data Base 1972
Northwest Districts. This offense accounts for 23.1 percent of the total Index crimes. The total value of property stolen was $3,230,510, while the amount of property recovered was valued at $420,663.

The records of the Dallas Police Department do not distinguish between the various degrees of thefts, however, Table II-18 assists in analyzing the larceny thefts that have occurred.

56.1 percent of all thefts involve the following: thefts from buildings (19 percent), shoplifting (13.5 percent), from autos (13.3 percent), and theft of bicycles (10.4 percent). Table II-19 represents additional analysis of all thefts.

7. AUTO THEFTS

There were 5,387 automobiles reported stolen in Dallas during 1972. This represents a substantial reduction of 22.1 percent when compared to the 6,914 auto thefts recorded in 1971. Figure II-8 indicates that this crime occurs equally throughout the city with approximately 4 percent separating each of the five districts. Auto thefts account for 12.49 percent of the total Index crimes.

A sample (September, 1972) was taken of auto thefts occurring within the City of Dallas. The total number of cars stolen in the month of September, 1972, was 375. The percent of the total autos stolen by make is shown in Table II-20. Table II-21 represents the percentage of cars stolen by year model and method. This data indicates that anti-theft devices on newer models have had a significant impact in making the theft of cars more difficult.

### TABLE II-18

City of Dallas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Property</th>
<th>$ Value Stolen</th>
<th>$ Value Recovered</th>
<th>$ Value Unrecovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currency, Notes, Etc.</td>
<td>1,365,037</td>
<td>61,020</td>
<td>1,304,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry, Precious Metals</td>
<td>1,171,421</td>
<td>98,115</td>
<td>1,073,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furs</td>
<td>58,030</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>50,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1,219,897</td>
<td>81,543</td>
<td>1,138,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Stolen Autos</td>
<td>6,141,923</td>
<td>4,476,346</td>
<td>1,665,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,781,588</td>
<td>651,899</td>
<td>5,129,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

### TABLE II-19

City of Dallas

Analysis of all Thefts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Theft</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value of Property Stolen</th>
<th>Value of Recoveries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket-Picking</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$ 18,925</td>
<td>$ 671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse-Snatch</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>13,215</td>
<td>3,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplift</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>116,182</td>
<td>55,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Autos</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>907,556</td>
<td>17,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>113,633</td>
<td>16,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Buildings</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>933,623</td>
<td>134,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin Operated Machines</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>18,244</td>
<td>2,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>1,002,777</td>
<td>228,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department
FIGURE II-8
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Auto Theft — Total 12.49% of Index Crime
TABLE II-20

City of Dallas
Make of Automobiles Stolen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chevrolet</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldsmobile</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

TABLE II-21

City of Dallas
Year Model and Method of Auto Thefts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Model</th>
<th>No Keys in Car</th>
<th>Keys in Car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1969</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 1973</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

8. DRUG ABUSE

Drug abuse crimes continue to escalate in Dallas. These crimes constitute a serious problem not only in their own regard, but also in the significant impact they have on Index crimes. The number of drug-related arrests and cases filed has increased tremendously over the past few years. Table II-22 compares statistics from 1966 to 1971.

Drug abuse among juveniles continues to increase. In a comparison of 1971 and 1972 figures for marijuana, total juvenile arrests increased 120 percent and cases filed increased 77 percent. For narcotics offenses, arrests increased 18 percent and cases filed increased a total of 275 percent. Overall drug arrests for juveniles increased 69 percent in 1972.

The link between drugs and Index crimes cannot be denied. In 1972, a Ninety-Day Crime/Drug Relation Survey, designed by the Dallas Police Department Drug Abuse Division, was conducted among 521 Index crime suspects being held in the City Jail. The following statistics were taken from the survey:

I. Percent of Crime That is Drug Related

A. Tabulation of all seven Index-Crime categories show that 46.6 percent of all crime is drug related (suspect's opinion).

B. Broken down by each offense, the survey shows the following results. These are the opinions of the people arrested for the crime in question.

1. Murder  20%
2. Rape    No Opinion
3. Robbery 64.8%
4. Auto Theft 53.2%
5. Theft Over $50 21.7%
6. Aggravated Assault 60.1%
7. Burglary 50.1%
TABLE II-22
City of Dallas
1966-1971 Drug Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Involved</th>
<th>Percent of Increase 1966-1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>+1253.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Filed On</td>
<td>+2251.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Filed</td>
<td>+2177.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>+332.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Filed On</td>
<td>+587.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Filed</td>
<td>+677.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>+93.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Filed On</td>
<td>+186.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Filed</td>
<td>+120.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>+303.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Filed On</td>
<td>+698.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Filed</td>
<td>+804.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

II. Twenty-eight and eight tenths percent of those interviewed admitted to being users of drugs (any type).

1. Murder 12.5%
2. Rape 10%
3. Robbery 32.8%
4. Auto Theft 28%
5. Theft Over $50 22.4%
6. Aggravated Assault 20.8%
7. Burglary 33.2%

III. Most frequently used drugs as admitted by persons arrested.

1. Murder — heroin
2. Rape — marijuana
3. Robbery — #1 marijuana; #2 heroin; #3 barbiturates
4. Auto Theft — #1 marijuana; #2 heroin; #3 amphetamines and barbiturates
5. Theft Over $50 — #1 marijuana; #2 heroin; #3 amphetamines and barbiturates
6. Aggravated Assault — #1 marijuana; #2 hallucinogens; #3 heroin
7. Burglary — #1 marijuana; #2 heroin; #3 barbiturates

II-23
Further substantiation of the drug/Index crime correlation is furnished in data collected by the Dallas Police Department Planning and Research Section in interviews conducted among 99 inmates at Huntsville Prison, March 4, 1972. The inmates were all arrested and convicted in Dallas County and had arrived at the penitentiary in January and February of 1972. The following information was obtained from these interviews:

- Use of drugs ranked second highest as the cause of criminal activity (21.2 percent).
- Need for drugs ranked second highest as the reason why persons become repeat offenders (30.3 percent).

It can be concluded that there is a definite correlation between the use of drugs and the rate of Index crimes.

9. JUVENILES AND INDEX CRIME

Juvenile delinquency continues to be a problem in Dallas. In 1972, 8,226 juvenile delinquents were processed, a 4.66 percent increase over the 1971 total. One thousand six hundred thirty-three (1,633) prosecution reports were filed.

Based on statistics in the Dallas Police Department 1972 Annual Report (age, sex and race of persons arrested), juveniles represent a substantial proportion of all those arrested for Index crimes. Table II-23 lists the percentage of juveniles to the total number arrested in 1972.

Juveniles constituted almost half of all persons arrested in 1972 for burglary and auto theft. They figured significantly in nearly all of the remaining Index crimes. Table II-24 highlights the increased juvenile delinquency problem. Arrests increased in five of the seven Index crime categories. Particular emphasis should be directed toward arrests for murder, rape, and aggravated assault, which increased 52 percent, 50 percent, and 42 percent respectively.

10. ORGANIZED CRIME

Members of the Greater Dallas Area Organized Crime Task Force (Metro Squad) have determined that there is organized crime of several types active in the area. They are as follows:

a. ORGANIZED BOOKMAKING

This is the most lucrative activity for organized criminals. It has been determined that there are definite conspiracies in this area. This is illustrated by the recent federal wiretap that resulted in federal indictments of eleven persons involved in a conspiracy of illegal bookmaking. The Intelligence Division of the Dallas Police Department indicated there are several other similar groups operating in this area. The fact that no betting line originates in Texas, and that six or seven betting lines come into the Dallas area from out of state from cities where Mafia families exist, shows a definite link for organized crime. In 1971, there were 71 felony bookmaking cases filed by the Metro Squad, 31 bookmaking search warrants issued, and 330 known bookmakers operating in the Dallas area.

b. FRAUD AND SWINDLE

There are a large number of white collar crime groups active in the Dallas area. They cost the economy between $150,000 and millions of dollars for each operation. At least one of these operations has been linked directly to a Mafia figure from the East. All of these operations are, by their very nature, criminal conspiracies and, therefore, organized criminal activities.
### TABLE II-23

**City of Dallas**

**Juveniles Arrested in 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Crime</th>
<th>Percent of Total Persons Arrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny/Theft</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

### TABLE II-24

**City of Dallas**

**1972 Juvenile Crime by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Juveniles Arrested-1971</th>
<th>Juveniles Arrested-1972</th>
<th>Percent Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+ 111.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+ 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>+ 36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>+ 74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>+ 16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny/Theft</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>- 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>- 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4482</td>
<td>4693</td>
<td>+ 4.7 Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department
c. IMPACT CRIMINAL ACTIVITY (ORGANIZED)

An example of an organized criminal group which engages in Impact or Index crimes is that of motorcycle gangs. It has been established that these gangs have engaged in the crimes of rape, robbery, burglary, auto theft, murder, and narcotics traffic in the Dallas area. Other examples of organized criminal activities involving Impact crimes are the groups of burglars which bond together. The Greater Dallas Area Organized Crime Task Force recently developed information on and made the arrest of a group of burglars who all used the same “fence.”

d. PROSTITUTION (PANDERING)

Vice activities continue to be a lucrative undertaking in Dallas. In a comparison of arrests for 1971 and 1972, prostitution arrests realized a decline while arrests for procuring showed a slight increase. Thirty-five percent of the prostitution arrests for 1972 represented individuals not previously apprehended.

Since prostitution is classified as a “victimless” crime, the number of actual offenses cannot be established. An effectively organized prostitution ring reaps great profits, which are subsequently funneled into any number of illegal activities.

e. NARCOTICS WHOLESALERS AND SMUGGLERS

The Drug Abuse Division of the Dallas Police Department made a concentrated effort during 1972 to develop drug cases against dealers and suppliers of illicit drugs with emphasis on heroin and cocaine. During 1972 the Drug Abuse Division developed 119 heroin sale cases, 50 marijuana sale cases, and 38 dangerous drug sale cases.

Involvement in narcotics traffic has become a major undertaking for organized crime factions. The profits to be realized in this area are tremendous and serve as a basic source of funding for numerous other activities.

f. PORNOGRAPHY

Arrests for pornography increased 59.2 percent from 1971 to 1972. It is known that organized elements are responsible for the majority of printing, shipping, and selling of these materials.

g. AUTO THEFT

Many cases of auto theft in the City of Dallas can be tied to organized gangs. In some cases a person will order several cars that he wishes to purchase and haul out of state. At least 10 auto theft rings were investigated in the City of Dallas in 1972.

h. FENCING

The Operations Analysis Unit of the Planning and Research Section of the Dallas Police Department maintains a list of more than 200 locations that have or will purchase stolen property.

Laws in the State of Texas need to be revised to allow prosecution of these fences. At the present time, an order from a judge is necessary to recover most stolen property from the fence making recovery of discovered stolen property a very lengthy process.

11. CIVIL DISORDER

Although the City of Dallas, with an estimated population of 878,000, has not experienced any major civil disorders, several demonstrations have occurred within the past year. Realizing that these conditions may recur, it is necessary that Dallas be prepared to adequately respond to these conditions.

Experience has shown that major civil disorders are often generated by commonly shared grievances among minority groups, inadequate communication channels, and inadequate response to the citizens' grievances.
12. REPEAT OFFENDER — A STUDY

During 1972 the Dallas Police Department generated a study dealing with the effect of the repeat offender upon the total crime situation within the City of Dallas. The study, released on September 28, 1972, relied principally on randomly selected arrest data during three months of 1972 and was supported by statistical data and information obtained through interviews with Dallas County prisoners confined in the Texas Department of Corrections.

The relationship that this study has shown exists between the repeat offender and the overall crime situation in Dallas is significant and is therefore being highlighted in this plan in an effort to accurately reflect the total crime situation as it is now known to exist. The repeat offender is defined as any person who has been arrested by a police agency, has had a case filed against him for a felony or major misdemeanor, and is subsequently re-arrested and filed on for other felonies or misdemeanors. The purpose of the Repeat Offender Study was to determine the amount of crime committed in Dallas by repeat offenders. The major sources of data for the research that formed the basis for this study were in four parts: 1) review of the literature, 2) inmate statistics, 3) interviews with inmates, and 4) arrest statistics and system time lags.

The following are the major problems summarized from the Study:

- Arrest statistics indicate that almost 60 percent of the suspects filed on by the Dallas Police Department are repeat offenders. Furthermore, they are responsible for 90 percent of the multiple clearances recorded and the commission of 99 percent of the offenses admitted by prison inmates.
- During 1971 repeat offenders were responsible for approximately 22,750 Index crimes, which was slightly less than half of the total recorded in the city during the year.
- Almost 70 percent of the persons charged with burglary were repeat offenders, and 64.5 percent of the persons charged with robbery were repeat offenders.
- There is a lack of continuity of information on criminal cases to permit measurement, evaluation and correction of problems in the criminal justice system in Dallas.
- Only one-half of the cases cleared by arrest are actually filed with the District Attorney or Juvenile Court.
- It is possible for repeat offenders to amass bonds and continue their criminal activities while awaiting trial.
- No systematic method exists where cases against repeat offenders can be disposed of quickly and routinely.
- An overwhelming majority of multiple offenders receive concurrent sentences for the crimes they commit.

Chapter V of the Repeat Offender Study is an example of one of the important aspects of the problem, which is outlined in detail. This chapter deals with the characteristics of the arrests made by the Dallas Police Department. The following is excerpted from this chapter:

The sample source used for this chapter was the names of all adult persons filed on for Index offenses during the months of January, April, and July of 1971. This sample yielded 1,076 persons. Records could not be located on nine persons after a diligent search of all available records, leaving a valid sample of 1,067. These months were picked
at random and represent 32 percent of the Index cases filed in 1971. From this total, it was determined by a search of the Dallas County Sheriff's Identification Section and the Dallas County District Attorney's Office that:

General Facts
- Six hundred and thirty-five (635) persons were repeat offenders. Four hundred and thirty-two (432) persons were first offenders.

Repeat Offenders
- Fifty-nine and two tenths percent of the persons filed on were repeat offenders.
- Fifty-four and five tenths percent of the repeat offenders were black and 45.5 percent were white, Mexican and others.
- Ninety-four and six tenths percent of the repeat offenders were male and 5.4 percent were female.
- The average age of the repeat offender was 27 years for males and 29 for females.

First Offenders
- Forty-eight and seven tenths percent of the first offenders were black and 51.3 percent white, Mexican and others.
- Eighty-five and four tenths percent of the first offenders were male and 14.6 percent were female.
- The average age of the first offender was 26 years for males and 28 years for females.

Table II-25 gives the relationship of offenders' previous history by offense. The table also shows the number of offenses filed on for each Index offense and the percent of those that are first or subsequent offenders. Burglary and robbery have the largest percent of repeaters with 69 and 64 respectively.

Figure II-9 graphically shows the fallout from the criminal justice system as it occurred in Dallas during 1971.

13. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS
a. BURGLARY
   Burglary offenses accounted for nearly half (47.5 percent) of all Index crimes in Dallas in 1972, showing a 17.2 percent increase over 1971 figures.

b. OTHER INDEX CRIMES
   In a comparison of 1971 crime rates of the four most populous cities in Texas, Dallas ranked either first or second in all seven Index crimes categories. Overall, Dallas ranked highest in a similar comparison of the 1971 total crime index rate per 100,000.

c. DRUG ABUSE
   Drug abuse presents a problem of dual significance. It is not only a serious violation of the law in its own regard, but it is also undeniably related to the incidence of Index crimes. It is evident that addicts must steal to support their habits.

d. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
   Juveniles represent a significant percent of those individuals arrested for Index crimes. By attacking the problem of juvenile delinquency we would likewise be attacking the problem of Index crime.
TABLE II-25
City of Dallas
Previous History by Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Charged With:</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>% Repeat Offenders</th>
<th>% First Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Index Crimes</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Repeat Offender Study
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e. ORGANIZED CRIME
Organized crime of several types is active in and around Dallas. While the Metro Squad has made headway in reducing the effectiveness and lucrativeness of organized crime, our efforts should be continued in this area.

f. THE MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY IN DALLAS
In view of the demonstrations that occurred in 1972, the prevention of major civil disorders must continue to receive attention.

C. CRIME IN THE SUBURBS
The following portion of this chapter outlines the crime and delinquency problems of the major suburban cities of Dallas County.

Particular emphasis is placed on the current conditions in the cities of Garland, Grand Prairie, and Mesquite. The crime problems for these three cities are set forth in detail as they have expressed an interest in applying for funding assistance during 1974. In each case the crime analysis has been conducted by the respective cities.

1972 crime data for additional suburban cities has been recorded from the 1972 Uniform Crime Reports submitted to the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council by each city.

1. CITY OF GARLAND
Total Index crimes in Garland increased 18.25 percent during 1972 compared to 1971. Table II-26 compares the total Index crimes committed from 1970 through 1972. The 2,263 Index crimes recorded during 1972 represent an all-time high in total number committed. Table II-27 lists the percentage of each crime to the total Index crimes and also the occurrences in rate per 100,000 for 1972. The crimes of burglary and theft over $50 occur most frequently per 100,000 and together account for approximately 75 percent of the total rate.

Figure II-10 shows the geographical occurrences by police district of the 1972 Index crimes in Garland. Table II-28 summarizes the losses resulting from all crimes in 1971 and 1972. Compared to 1971 there was a 26 percent increase in dollar amounts of property stolen and a 91 percent increase in the amount of property recovered for 1972.

The following is an analysis of individual crime as it occurred during 1972:

a. MURDER

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{Total Victims} & \text{Total Offenders} \\
11 & 10 \\
\end{array}
\]

(1) Possible Causes
The majority of crimes committed (88 percent) were the result of accident. Ten percent were crimes of passion: i.e., anger. Twenty percent were fear motivated.

(2) Characteristics of Act
The majority were the result of motor vehicle accident (70 percent). The other 30 percent involved the use of firearms.

(3) Profile of Offender
The majority were married, male. Fifty percent were employed and 50 percent were unemployed. Forty percent were Garland residents, 20 percent were Dallas County residents, and 40 percent were from outside Dallas County. The majority (70 percent) were the result of accident, 20 percent were motivated by fear, and 10 percent were anger motivated. Thirty percent were black and 70 percent were white. Average age was 34 years.
TABLE II-26
City of Garland
1970-1972 Index Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>2263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

TABLE II-27
City of Garland
1972 Rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>1972 Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>41.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>325.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>767.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>40.57</td>
<td>899.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>171.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2263</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2216.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 1972 Estimated Population of 102,078

Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
FIGURE II-10
Garland Police Department
1972 — Total Offenses by District

Code:
1-Murder
2-Rape
3-Robbery
4-Assault
5-Burglary
6-Theft
7-Auto Theft

*District Number - Upper right corner of each district.

Source: Garland Police Department - 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
II-33
TABLE II-28
City of Garland
1971-1972 Stolen Property Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Stolen</td>
<td>$718,525</td>
<td>$905,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Recovered</td>
<td>152,578</td>
<td>291,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Recovery</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Garland Police Department

(4) Victim Profile
The majority, regardless of race, were male, employed, single, did not know the offender, were susceptible, and were Garland residents. Eighteen percent were black and 82 percent were white. Average age was 28 years.

b. RAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Possible Causes
Crimes in this category were committed for sexual gratification.

(2) Characteristics of Act
One hundred percent of the offenses involved the use of force and/or threats.

(3) Profile of Offender
One hundred percent of the offenders, regardless of race, were single, male, and friends of the victim. The majority (75 percent) were unemployed, laborers and Garland residents. The average age of the offender was 21 years. Fifty percent were black and 50 percent were white.

(4) Victim Profile
The majority of the victims, regardless of race, were unemployed, provoked the offender (57 percent), and female. The majority (72 percent) suffered no injury and 86 percent had no time loss. Twenty-nine percent of the victims were black and 71 percent were white. Average age was 20 years.

c. ROBBERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Possible Causes
The majority of the offenders were unemployed and motivated by a need for personal gain.
(2) Characteristics of Act
One hundred percent of the offenses involved the use of force and/or threats and the majority were committed during the hours of darkness.

(3) Profile of Offender
One hundred percent were males, the majority had records of prior arrest and 64 percent of the prior arrests were for robbery. The majority were unemployed, unskilled laborers, Garland residents and were unmarried. One hundred percent were unknown to the victim and averaged an age of 21 years. Fifty-four percent were black and 46 percent were white.

(4) Victim Profile
The majority, regardless of race, were married males, employed, did not know the offender, and suffered no time loss. One hundred percent were susceptible and suffered some monetary loss. Ninety-six percent were white and 4 percent were black. The average age was 34 years.

d. ASSAULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Possible Causes
One hundred percent of the offenses were anger motivated and the majority were committed against friends or family members.

(2) Characteristics of Act
The majority were some form of beating using hands and/or feet, were committed against friends or family members and occurred during the evening hours.

(3) Profile of Offender
The majority, regardless of race, were male, married, employed laborers, Garland residents and averaged an age of 27 years. The majority were known to the victim. Thirty-nine percent had records of prior arrest and 69 percent of this number had prior arrests for assault. Seventy-three percent were white and 27 percent were black.

(4) Victim Profile
The majority, regardless of race, were married, employed males and knew the offender. The majority suffered physical injury but suffered no time loss as a result. The average age was 29 years. Sixty-two percent were white and 38 percent were black.

e. BURGLARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Burglaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of burglaries committed were crimes of opportunity. Residence burglaries recorded an average loss of $283.00, while the average loss in business burglaries was $256.00. Of all offenses sampled, 100 percent involved the use of some force. Table II-29, II-30, II-31, II-32 and II-33 depict the general characteristics of 1972 offenses. The average age of burglary offenders was 20 years.
TABLE II-29
City of Garland
1972 Residential Burglary*
Types of Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Loss</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guns</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Random Sampling — 116 Victims
Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

TABLE II-30
City of Garland
1972 Residential Burglaries*
Methods of Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Entry</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear Door</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Door</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Door</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Window</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Window</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Window</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Random Sampling — 116 Victims
Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
TABLE II-31
City of Garland
1972 Commercial Burglaries
Types of Businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Businesses</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools or Churches</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Homes</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Sites</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouses</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s Office or Pharmacy</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Retail Shop</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Random Sample — 47 Victims
Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

TABLE II-32
City of Garland
1972 Commercial Burglaries
Methods of Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Entry</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Door</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Door</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Random Sample — 47 Victims
Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
TABLE II-33
City of Garland
1972 Burglary Offender Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Race and Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- White</td>
<td>85% (92% male, 8% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Black</td>
<td>15% (91% male, 9% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Married</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Not Married</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Prior Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Prior Arrests</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- First Offenders</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Students</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Skilled Laborers</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Unskilled</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Employed</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Unemployed</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Garland</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Dallas County</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--- Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Sample — 74 Offenders

Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

f. THEFT OVER $50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(random sample)

(1) Possible Causes
The majority of offenses were committed for personal gain and were committed as the result of poor security measures resulting in opportunity for the offender.

(2) Characteristics of Act
The majority of offenses involved the use of some form of force, occurred during the hours of darkness and in residential neighborhoods. The majority of offenses involved loss of property as opposed to cash.

(3) Profile of Offender
The majority of offenders, regardless of race, were unmarried, unemployed, unskilled laborers and Garland residents. Thirty-two percent had records of prior arrests and 58 percent of this number had prior arrests for theft. One hundred percent were male and were unknown to the victim. Eighty-three percent were white and 17 percent were black. Average age was 17 years.

(4) Victim Profile
The majority of victims, regardless of race, were married, employed, and were males. The majority were susceptible to the offense and were unknown to the offender. The average age was 32.

(5) Economic and/or Social Cost
Average monetary loss was $398.00
g. AUTO THEFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(random sample)

(1) Possible Cause
The majority of offenses involved a motivation of joy-riding facilitated by opportunity and availability.

(2) Characteristics of Act
The majority of offenses occurred at private residences or apartments, involved passenger cars with the ignition keys removed, and occurred during nighttime hours. One hundred percent were driven away from the scene. The majority of the recoveries were made in Garland.

(3) Profile of Offender
The majority, regardless of race, were unmarried, employed males. Thirty-eight percent had records of prior arrests and of this number, 42 percent had prior arrests for auto theft. The majority were Garland residents. One hundred percent were unknown to the victim. The average age was 22. Eighty percent were white and 20 percent were black.

(4) Victim Profile
The majority, regardless of race, were married, employed males. The majority were Garland residents and did not know the offender. The average age was 35. Ninety-five percent were white and 5 percent were black.

(5) Economic and/or Social Cost
Average monetary loss was $1,400.00.

h. DRUG OFFENSES
There were a total of 252 arrests during 1972 for violation of the state narcotic laws. This represents an increase of 15.5 percent compared to 1970 and 11.11 percent compared to 1971. Table II-34 analyzes these arrests by the various types of narcotic violations.

i. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS AND CONCLUSIONS

(1) Preliminary Identification of Crime Problems
From a thorough review of the offense reports from 1970 to date, it has been determined that the vast majority of crime problems fall within the area of burglaries and thefts. These reports revealed that the majority of offenses occurred during the hours of darkness in residential neighborhoods and that a large number of offenders had records of prior arrests. This review further revealed that in a substantial number of these offenses the victim had failed to take adequate security measures.

Although not reflected in the above mentioned reports, other records and methodology indicate the incidence of identification, recovery, and subsequent return of stolen property is extremely low.

(2) Preliminary Conclusions
To effectively combat the problems regarding burglaries and thefts, several means of attack will be needed. These efforts should include special squads armed with specific and detailed data for prevention and apprehension; an effective intelligence network working with all members of this department and with the intelligence units of other agencies; public education regarding preventive measures in homes and businesses; and, improved reporting and analysis of offenses.
TABLE II-34
City of Garland
1972 Drug Offenses — Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Offense</th>
<th>Total Arrested</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opium, Cocaine, Morphine, Heroin, Codeine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Narcotics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Drugs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (paraphernalia, others not classified)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Garland Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

2. CITY OF GRAND PRAIRIE

Index crimes increased by 12.5 percent in 1972 compared to 1971. Table II-35 represents the comparison of total Index crimes committed in 1971 and 1972. The most significant increases occurred in burglary offenses. Burglary, combined with theft over $50, comprised 77 percent of all Index crime in 1972. Table II-36 shows the rate of occurrence for each Index crime per 100,000. The rate per 100,000 of 3034.5 places Grand Prairie crime as the third highest in Dallas County.

The following is a statistical summary of all Index crimes occurring during 1972:

a. MURDER

The four murders which occurred in 1972 accounted for .2 percent of the total Index crime. There were five arrests for murder during 1972. All arrests were of adults.

b. RAPE

Rape offenses accounted for .7 percent of the total Index crimes in 1972. Of the 21 rapes recorded, ten occurred between the hours of 1 a.m. and 11 a.m. The majority (eight) of the rapes occurred in District 2. There were 13 arrests for this offense during 1972 and 25 cases were filed.

c. ROBBERY

The 26 robberies recorded in 1972 represented 1.4 percent of the total Index crimes. Fifty percent of the robberies occurred in District 5. Seventeen robberies occurred between 2 p.m. and 11 p.m. There were 23 arrests for robbery during 1972 and 21 cases were filed. Table II-37 shows the amounts stolen in all robbery offenses for 1972.

d. AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

Aggravated assault offenses represented 9.7 percent of the total Index crimes. Of the 166 offenses, 72 were committed in District 5 with 144 committed in the 12-hour period from 3 p.m. to 3 a.m. There were 118 arrests made for aggravated assault with 40 cases filed.
## TABLE II-35
City of Grand Prairie
1971-1972 Index Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Assault</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

## TABLE II-36
City of Grand Prairie
1972 Rate per 100,000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>1972 Total</th>
<th>Rate Per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Assault</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>301.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1221.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1116.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>318.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>3034.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 1972 Estimated Population of 55,000

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
TABLE II-37
City of Grand Prairie
Value Stolen in Robbery Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Robbery</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial House</td>
<td>$3,887.39</td>
<td>$5,034.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Station</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Store</td>
<td>569.20</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>333.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>4,357.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,533.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,589.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1972 Value Recovered: $943.00

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

Table II-38 reflects the incidences of burglary in 1971 and 1972 by type. Table II-39 indicates a plurality of residential burglaries in District 4. Breakdowns have shown 123 residential burglaries compared to 33 apartment (or multi-family dwelling) burglaries with non-residential burglaries showing only 35 offenses. Comparing this district's figures with those of the other four districts shows that emphasis should be on residential burglaries in this district. Residences in this area are mostly newer homes in the middle-class income bracket.

Tables II-40 and II-41 reflect the amounts of loss and amounts recovered in the various types of burglary offenses in 1971 and 1972. The value of loss in burglary offenses increased 54.8 percent from 1971 to 1972. The value of loss in burglary offenses increased 54.8 percent from 1971 to 1972. Table II-42 reflects the time of occurrence for the 1972 burglaries. Most burglaries are reported between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. and can be classified as daytime burglaries. This statistic indicates that the offense has usually been committed previously and is being discovered by victims returning from work at the end of the day. There were 279 jail arrests for burglary in 1972 with 74 cases filed.

TABLE II-38
City of Grand Prairie
1971-1972 Burglaries, By Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Burglary</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence/Nighttime</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence/Daytime</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residence/Nighttime</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residence/Daytime</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>547</strong></td>
<td><strong>673</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
TABLE II-39
City of Grand Prairie
Incidence of Burglary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence Burglaries</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Burglaries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residence Burglaries</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
- Residence/nighttime: 180
- Residence/daytime: 183
- Non-residence/nighttime: 285
- Non-residence/daytime: 25
- (Unfounded): 15

1972 Burglary Total: 688

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

TABLE II-40
City of Grand Prairie
Amount of Loss — Burglary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence/nighttime</td>
<td>$42,737</td>
<td>$32,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence/daytime</td>
<td>47,195</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residence/nighttime</td>
<td>103,613</td>
<td>53,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residence/daytime</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$195,228</td>
<td>$106,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
TABLE II-41
City of Grand Prairie
Amount of Loss Recovered, 1972 — Burglary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount Recovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence/nighttime</td>
<td>$ 7,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence/daytime</td>
<td>10,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residence/nighttime</td>
<td>11,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residence daytime</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 29,818</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

TABLE II-42
City of Grand Prairie
1972 Burglaries — Time of Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midnight — 3 a.m.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 — 6 a.m.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 — 9 a.m.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 — 12 noon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon — 3 p.m.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 — 6 p.m.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 — midnight</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>678</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

f. THEFT OVER $50
The 614 offenses that occurred in this category during 1972 represented 36.9 percent of the total Index crimes. Theft over $50 occurred at the rate of 1116.4 per 100,000 and ranks second to burglary in terms of frequency. Two hundred thirty (230) cases were cleared by arrest during 1972 and 140 arrests were made in this category. Approximately 48 percent of these offenses occurred in Districts 4 and 5 and an analysis of times of occurrence reflects a similar relationship to the times recorded for burglaries.

g. AUTO THEFT
There were 175 automobiles stolen in 1972, reflecting a decrease of seven compared to 1971. Sixty-seven were cleared by arrest in this category during 1972. There were 13 cases filed. Loss in these cases amounted to $199,591. $114,510.00 was recovered.

h. DRUG OFFENSES
Violations in this category have increased substantially during the past few years. Jail arrests in 1972 in all drug offenses increased 100 percent over 1971. Table II-43 depicts the arrests for all drug violations during 1972.

18.8 percent of all males arrested were 16 years of age or younger. Thirty-two percent of all males arrested on drug charges were between 17 and 20 years of age. Rates indicate further problems with 37 percent of all females arrested being 17 years of age or younger. Thirty-two percent were 18 to 20 years of age. Total narcotics arrests during 1972 totaled 428 persons.
i. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS

(1) Burglary and Theft Over $50

These two crimes occurred more frequently than all others and showed substantial increases during 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violations</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-16</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Dangerous Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Narcotics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Narcotic Paraph.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Class A Narc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Hallucinogens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Barbiturates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Amphetamines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Drugs w/Forced Presc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Inhalants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Marijuana</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grand Prairie Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

(2) Drug Abuse

A large number of crimes cleared by the department have been tied directly to felons who are drug addicted and are trying to support their habit. It is estimated that total addict involvement in burglary and theft over $50 crimes is consistently 50 percent. An alarming statistic among the drug arrests made in 1972 is that 18.8 percent of all males arrested were sixteen years of age or under.
3. CITY OF MESQUITE

During 1972, Index offenses increased approximately 15 percent when compared to 1971. Table II-44 compares the occurrence of Index crimes in 1971 and 1972. Significant increases were recorded in three categories: aggravated assault, burglary, and auto theft. Burglary and theft over $50 continued in 1972 as the most frequently occurring crimes. There were 419 Index offenses cleared during 1972, representing 31 percent of the total offenses committed.

Index offenses occurred at the rate of 2,124 per 100,000 during 1972, the highest amount recorded in Mesquite within the last eight years. Table II-45 represents the total value of property stolen and recovered during 1971 and 1972.

The following are general profiles of the victims and offenders of Index crimes and narcotics offenses in Mesquite as taken from 1972 data:

a. MURDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II-44
City of Mesquite
1971-1972 Index Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mesquite Police Department 1974 Criminal Justice Plan

TABLE II-45
City of Mesquite
1971-1972 Property Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>$ 29,841</td>
<td>$ 7,732</td>
<td>$ 30,491</td>
<td>$ 2,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>7,828</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>10,452</td>
<td>2,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furs</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>11,704</td>
<td>3,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>189,500</td>
<td>120,848</td>
<td>268,123</td>
<td>172,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>245,382</td>
<td>61,280</td>
<td>188,458</td>
<td>49,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$481,181</td>
<td>$193,726</td>
<td>$509,328</td>
<td>$224,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mesquite Police Department — 1974 Criminal Justice Plan
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(1) **Victim Profile**

- Actual number of persons killed: 4
- Average age: 44.4 years
- Race: 100 percent or 4 white
- Sex: 100 percent or 4 male
- Marital Status: 100 percent or 4 married
- Relationship to offender: 25 percent or 1 stranger to stranger, 50 percent or 2 friend, 25 percent or 1 married to offender

(2) **Offender Profile**

- Actual number of offenders: 7
- Average age: 25.1 years
- Race: 100 percent or 7 white
- Sex: 86 percent or 6 male, 14 percent or 1 female
- Marital Status: 86 percent or 6 married, 14 percent or 1 single
- Previous arrest for similar offense: 100 percent none
- Previous arrest for other offense: 28 percent or 2

---

b. **RAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) **Victim Profile**

- Actual number of persons raped: 4
- Average age: 29.5 years
- Race: 100 percent or 4 white
- Sex: 100 percent or 4 female
- Marital Status: 50 percent or 2 married, 50 percent or 2 single
- Relationship to offender: 50 percent or 2 were friends, 25 percent or 1 were stranger to stranger, 25 percent or 1 data not available

(2) **Offender Profile**

- Actual number of offenders: 3
- Average Age: 22 years
- Race: 100 percent or 3 white
- Sex: 100 percent or 3 male
- Marital Status: 33 percent or 1 married, 66 percent or 2 single
- Previous arrest for similar offense: 100 percent none
- Previous arrest for other offense: 66 percent or 2
c. ROBBERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Victim Profile
Actual number of persons robbed: 19
Average age: 36.2 years
Race: 95 percent or 18 white, 5 percent or 1 black
Sex: 55 percent or 10 male, 45 percent or 9 female
Marital Status: 55 percent or 10 married, 45 percent or 9 single
Relationship to Offender: 10 percent or 2 were friends
90 percent or 17 were stranger to stranger

(2) Offender Profile
Actual number of offenders: 7
Average age: 21.1 years
Race: 52 percent or 4 white, 48 percent or 3 black
Sex: 68 percent or 5 male, 32 percent or 2 female
Marital Status: 52 percent or 4 married, 48 percent or 3 single
Previous arrest for similar offense: 15 percent or 1
Previous arrest for other offense: 56 percent or 4

d. AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Victims</th>
<th>Total Cleared by Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Victim Profile
Sample number of persons assaulted: 22
Average age: 23.5 years
Race: 100 percent or 22 white
Sex: 68 percent or 15 male, 32 percent or 7 female
Marital Status: 41 percent or 9 married, 59 percent or 13 single
Relationship to offender: 68 percent or 15 were friends
32 percent or 7 were stranger to stranger

(2) Offender Profile
Number of offenders sampled: 8
Average age: 24.8 years
Race: 88 percent or 7 white, 12 percent or 1 black
Sex: 75 percent or 6 male, 25 percent or 2 female
Marital Status: 64 percent or 5 married, 36 percent or 3 single
Previous arrest for similar offense: 50 percent or 4
Previous arrest for other offense: 60 percent or 5
e. BURGLARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Offenses</th>
<th>Total Cleared by Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Victim Profile
Sample number of persons burglarized: 87
Average age: 32.5 years
Race: 100 percent or 87 white
Sex: 92 percent or 80 male, 8 percent or 7 female
Marital Status: 74 percent or 64 married, 26 percent or 23 single
Relationship to offender: 14 percent or 12 were friends
86 percent or 75 were stranger to stranger

(2) Offender Profile
Number of offenders sampled: 26
Average age: 15.5 years
Race: 100 percent or 26 white
Sex: 100 percent or 26 male
Marital Status: 8 percent or 2 married, 92 percent or 24 single
Previous arrest for similar offense: 7 percent or 2
Previous arrest for other offense: 23 percent or 6

f. THEFT OVER $50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Offenses</th>
<th>Total Cleared by Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Victim Profile
Sample number of persons victimized: 95
Average age: 32.7 years
Race: 96 percent or 91 white, 4 percent or 4 black
Sex: 82 percent or 78 male, 18 percent or 17 female
Marital Status: 76 percent or 72 married, 24 percent or 23 single
Relationship to offender: 24 percent or 23 were friends
76 percent or 72 were stranger to stranger

(2) Offender Profile
Number of offenders sampled: 34
Average age: 23
Race: 67 percent or 23 white, 33 percent or 11 black
Sex: 52 percent or 18 male, 48 percent or 16 female
Marital Status: 30 percent or 10 married, 70 percent or 24 single
Previous arrest for similar offense: 20 percent or 7
Previous arrest for other offense: 50 percent or 17
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g. AUTO THEFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Offenses</th>
<th>Total Cleared by Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Offender Profile

Number of offenders sampled: 18
Average age: 17.5 years
Race: 100 percent or 8 white
Sex: 100 percent or 8 male
Marital Status: 100 percent or 8 single
Previous arrest for similar offense: 50 percent or 4
Previous arrest for other offense: 75 percent or 6

h. NARCOTICS (INCLUDES MARIJUANA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Offenses</th>
<th>Total Cleared by Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Offender Profile

Number of offenders sampled: 23
Average age: 22.8 years
Race: 91 percent or 22 white, 9 percent or 1 black
Sex: 79 percent or 18 male, 21 percent or 5 female
Marital Status: 33 percent or 8 married, 66 percent or 15 single
Previous arrest for similar offense: 33 percent or 8
Previous arrest for other offense: 49 percent or 11

i. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS

(1) Burglary and Theft Over $50

The frequency with which these two crimes occur dictates that remedial action should be taken to bring about a reduction.

(2) Other Index Crimes

The rate of 2108.24 per 100,000 indicates that the frequency of the crimes is excessive and should be reduced.

(3) Drug Abuse

Narcotic arrests during 1972 were greater than in any Index crime category. Because of the fact that this offense is increasing and the direct effect it is known to have in the commission of other crimes, this crime can be ranked as a major concern for this city.
4. OTHER DALLAS COUNTY CITIES

The following data depicts crime statistics for 1971 (where available) and 1972 for additional cities within Dallas County. The cities are listed alphabetically and the data has been summarized from reports submitted by the police departments in the respective cities.

a. CARROLLTON

1972 Estimated Population: 18,200
1971 Estimated Population: 16,028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg.</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>0. $50</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1785.7</td>
<td>291.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>3192.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>961.5</td>
<td>1785.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>835.9</td>
<td>311.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>1958.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>680.0</td>
<td>835.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. COCKRELL HILL

1970 Census Population: 3,515

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg.</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>0. $50</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>1676.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>511.4</td>
<td>795.5</td>
<td>795.5</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 c. DESOTO

1970 Census Population: 6,617

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg.</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>0. $50</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1314.2</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>2069.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>574.0</td>
<td>1314.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 d. DUNCANVILLE

1972 Estimated Population: 18,000
1971 Estimated Population: 16,053

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg.</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>0. $50</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>550.0</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>1411.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>655.6</td>
<td>550.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>579.4</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>1451.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>635.5</td>
<td>579.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### e. FARMERS BRANCH

- **1972 Estimated Population:** 40,000
- **1971 Estimated Population:** 33,746

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0-$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>1347.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>485.0</td>
<td>647.5</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>1140.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>323.0</td>
<td>645.9</td>
<td>116.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. HIGHLAND PARK

- **1970 Census Population:** 10,133

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0-$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>1569.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>592.3</td>
<td>829.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>967.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266.5</td>
<td>671.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### g. HUTCHINS

- **1970 Census Population:** 1,755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0-$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>2784.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>909.1</td>
<td>1818.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### h. IRVING

- **1972 Estimated Population:** 107,350
- **1971 Estimated Population:** 102,305

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0-$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>2738</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>2550.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>849.6</td>
<td>1189.6</td>
<td>326.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>2878</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>2813.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>646.1</td>
<td>843.5</td>
<td>975.5</td>
<td>286.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### i. LANCASTER

- **1972 Estimated Population:** 13,000
- **1971 Estimated Population:** 11,761

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0-$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>938.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>523.1</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>1062.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>569.7</td>
<td>289.1</td>
<td>102.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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j. RICHARDSON
1972 Estimated Population: 53,000
1971 Estimated Population: 49,594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0–$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>1443.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>573.6</td>
<td>641.5</td>
<td>124.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>1617.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>582.8</td>
<td>742.1</td>
<td>153.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k. SEAGOVILLE
1970 Census Population: 4,390

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0–$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>2437.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>318.9</td>
<td>956.7</td>
<td>842.8</td>
<td>113.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

l. UNIVERSITY PARK
1972 Estimated Population: 23,500
1971 Estimated Population: 23,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg. Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft 0–$50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 No.</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Rate</td>
<td>1395.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>357.5</td>
<td>855.3</td>
<td>136.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 No.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Rate</td>
<td>948.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>710.6</td>
<td>136.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

The investigative responsibilities of the Dallas County Sheriff's Office include all of the 28 incorporated municipalities in the county, with primary patrol and/or investigative duties required in 16 of these cities. The majority of these cities have some type of police service and record and report their individual crime statistics. Table II-46 sets forth the number of Index crimes reported to the Sheriff's Office; however, in order to prevent the possibility of duplicate counting, these Index crimes have not been added to the total records for Dallas County.

D. MAJOR CRIME PROBLEMS OF DALLAS COUNTY

1. CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

The crimes of burglary, theft over $50 and auto theft accounted for 84 percent of the total Index crimes in Dallas County during 1972. In most cities these crimes increased substantially during the past year. Indicative of the seriousness of the problem, however, is burglary. This offense, which has been identified as a major Impact crime, rose 17.21 percent in 1972 in the City of Dallas alone. Dallas also recorded a total property value loss attributed
to burglary in excess of $5 million. Record totals were also recorded in all cities in the county. Likewise, the losses attributed to theft over $50 and auto theft occurred at high rates. As an example, the City of Garland recorded a total property value loss of nearly $1 million during 1972. The total value of stolen property as recorded by the Dallas Police Department was in excess of $17 million.

TABLE II-46
Dallas County Sheriff's Office
1972 Reported Index Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Number Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder and Assault to Murder</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery and Assault to Rob</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape and Assault to Rape</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary and Attempt to Burglarize</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS

While the crimes of murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault comprised but 16 percent of the total Index crimes, they occurred at a rate in excess of 550 per 100,000 population during 1972. This exceeded the 1971 averages for the State of Texas based on the available 1971 statistics (1972 data is not available yet).

All of these crimes are designated Impact crimes as they occur between strangers and their gravity is emphasized in light of the effect that each has upon the community's attitude toward safety and security. The fear of stranger-to-stranger street crime is beginning to be felt strongly in some areas of the city and county. It, of course, has virtually destroyed the life of some cities in the nation.

Decreases in these crimes were noted in the City of Dallas during 1972, however, further reduction must be sought. Comparing 1971 Index crime statistics of crimes against persons per rate of 100,000 with cities in the state, Dallas was first in rape and aggravated assault and second in murder and robbery. More alarming, the compared rates show that in those Impact crimes in which Dallas leads, the margin of difference is substantial. As an example, the Dallas rate of rape and aggravated assault was 69.2 and 625.5 respectively. Houston's rate of rape offenses was second with 42.9 while San Antonio's rate of aggravated assault offenses was second with 819.6.

Notably, these crimes increased in a majority of the cities and, in some cases, at a serious rate. Aggravated assaults more than doubled in Garland during 1972 (332 from 155 in 1971), and went from 82 in 1971 to 115 in 1972 in Mesquite.

3. DRUG ABUSE

In all cases in Dallas County drug offenses showed a substantial increase. A 1972 study by the Dallas Police Department of 521 Index crime suspects showed that, in the suspect's opinion, approximately 46.6 percent of Index crime offenses were drug related. More than half (50 percent) of all robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, and auto thefts were thought to be drug related. Robbery, aggravated assault, and burglary are Impact crimes.

Similar conditions are reported in the suburban cities and are increasing in considerable amounts. Drug arrests in Garland increased 15.5 percent in 1972, jail arrests in Grand Prairie for drug violations increased 100 percent compared to 1971, and there were 116 arrests last
year for felony narcotics offenses in Mesquite. The link between drug abuse and other crimes makes it imperative that this be given priority attention in attempting to curb the crime in Dallas County.

4. JUVENILE CRIME

During 1972 the number of juvenile offenders processed by the Youth Division of the Dallas Police Department increased 4.66 percent over the 1971 total. Included in the 8,226 referrals were juvenile offenders who comprised almost half of all arrests for burglary, auto theft, and a substantial percentage of all arrests for the remaining Index offenses. Particular emphasis is directed toward murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, which increased 52 percent, 50 percent, 26 percent and 42 percent respectively from 1971 to 1972. Dallas County Juvenile Department referrals increased by 5 percent during 1972, with the overwhelming percentage of juvenile court dispositions relating to burglary and auto theft offenders.

5. ORGANIZED CRIME

Organized crime of several types has been noted to be active within the Dallas area. Specifically, organized criminal elements dealing with drugs, gambling, and additional crimes have been attacked by the Dallas Area Organized Crime Task Force. The advent of the new Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport and the expected increased transient population in the area gives cause to be increasingly alert to the continued possibility of growth of organized crime in Dallas County.

6. THE MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY IN DALLAS

The prevention of major civil disorders in Dallas must continue. All Dallas area criminal justice agencies must be constantly alert to all situations which could possibly spark social disorder. Demonstrations that occurred during 1972 point to the importance of planning, training, and strengthening police-community relations.
III. SYSTEM CAPABILITIES
III. SYSTEM CAPABILITIES

This chapter identifies and discusses the various criminal justice activities existing within Dallas County today. There are four sections into which this discussion is divided:

- Law Enforcement
- Adjudication
- Corrections
- Information Systems

The material upon which the major portion of this chapter is based was taken from currently available sources, especially as it pertains to federal and state agencies.

Local agencies and organizations are described in detail and emphasis has been placed on the strengths, weaknesses, and general needs of the major components of the system. Where available, data regarding manpower, training, facilities, equipment, and resources have been set forth.

Particular attention in the law enforcement section has been directed toward those cities which have expressed an interest in seeking 1974 Texas Criminal Justice Council funding. These cities — Dallas, Garland, Grand Prairie, and Mesquite — are discussed in detail. Manpower and budget totals are listed for the additional law enforcement agencies.

A. LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. FEDERAL
   a. BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS (BNDD)
      - Regional headquarters in Dallas.
      - Charged with preventing traffic in and use of dangerous drugs and narcotics within the United States.
   
   b. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI)
      - Dallas Division located in city.
      - Responsible for investigating interstate crime, internal security, civil inquiries plus over one hundred styles of investigations.
      - Files open to local authorities.
      - Operates lab facilities in Washington, D. C., used by local agencies.
      - Operates National Crime Information Center (NCIC) in Washington — tied by computerization link to Dallas Police Department and Dallas County Sheriff's Office.
   
   c. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICES
      - Investigates and enforces laws relating to the smuggling or unauthorized entry of aliens into the United States.
   
   d. UNITED STATES MARSHAL
      - Access to services through Dallas and Ft. Worth headquarters.
      - Civil and criminal responsibilities include serving of writs and orders of federal courts.
      - Serves as custodian for federal prison.
   
   e. ALCOHOL, TOBACCO TAX, AND FIREARMS DIVISION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
      - Enforces all IRS laws relating to beverages and products with alcoholic content.
      - Enforces gun control laws.
• Enforces laws regulating manufacture and distribution of tobacco and tobacco-related goods.
• Special Investigator — Firearms in Dallas.

f. BUREAU OF CUSTOMS
• Inhibits the illegal entry into the United States of contraband and unlawful drugs.
• Prevents theft of goods consigned to their custody.
• Close coordination of BNDD and local officials.

g. UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE
• Protects the President and other distinguished officials.
• Active suppression of counterfeiting of United States currency.
• Active apprehension of forgers of governmental checks, bonds and negotiable paper.
• Close coordination with local agencies, especially on VIP visitors.

h. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE — INTELLIGENCE UNIT
• Concerned with Revenue Code violations.
• Located in Dallas/Ft. Worth.

i. POSTAL INSPECTION SERVICE
• Investigates criminal activity involving the Post Office such as mail theft, mail fraud and mailing of obscene materials.
• Regulates other material such as explosives, bombs, or extortion letters sent in the mail.

j. UNITED STATES PROBATION
• Responsible for federal prisoners released on probation.

2. STATE

a. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (DPS)
• Responsible for enforcing laws relating to motor vehicles.
• Assists local officials in crime investigations, crime laboratory services, central records maintenance, statistical information.
• Texas Rangers and DPS services located in Dallas.

b. TEXAS ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION
• Administers the liquor laws of Texas.
• Maintains district office in Dallas.
• Polices and processes liquor licenses.

c. OFFICE OF THE CONSUMER — CREDIT COMMISSION
• Increase public’s knowledge about consumer debt.
• Enforces state laws against deceptive trade practices.
• Enforces vending machine laws.

3. LOCAL

a. DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT
   (1) Organizational Structure

The Dallas Police Department's actual manpower strength at the close of 1972 was 2511 total employees of which 1893 were sworn personnel. This was slightly less than the authorized strength of 2602 total employees and 1900 sworn personnel.
Estimated expenditures for 1971-72 were $28,144,984 and the proposed expenditures for 1972-73 are $29,335,000.

Figure III-1 sets forth the department's organizational chart. The following is a detailed description of each division. Work trends, operating cost, and staffing information for each division have been included where possible.

**Administration**

The administration activity provides general supervision for the department. The Chief of Police with the assistance of his immediate staff directs and controls all police department activities. Operating Cost: $371,150. Staffing: Sworn — 10; Civilian — 8; Total — 18.

**Communications Section**

The Communications Section of the Support Services Bureau is responsible for the operation of the Department's radio communications system. Calls for police service are received and dispatched, and selected offense reports are prepared and expedited for followup investigation.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Service Calls Received</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Service Calls Dispatched</td>
<td>365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense Reports Received by Expediter Unit</td>
<td>35,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $1,368,814.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 48; Civilian — 104; Total — 152.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Services Division**

The Community Services Division's primary function is to design, develop, and administer programs to improve relations between police and the community. The activities of this Division include administration of "Operation: Get Involved," a program establishing neighborhood beat committees, operation of community storefronts, coordinating and staffing the Police Athletic League which involves approximately 1,700 youths and a crime prevention team that specializes in anti-burglary programs for private dwellings and businesses. This Division also furnishes counsel for individuals having medical and psychological problems that cause them to become involved in the criminal justice process.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beat Committees Established</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storefronts in Operation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat Committee Meetings</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Attendance</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Teams</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Inspection</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Contacts</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $609,114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 28; Civilian — 26; Total — 54.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE III-1
Dallas Police Department
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III-4
Criminal Investigation Division

The Criminal Investigation Division investigates criminal offenses and crime related incidents for the purpose of identifying and apprehending each law violator, and recovering lost or stolen property.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder Offenses</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Cleared</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Offenses</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Cleared</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Offenses</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Cleared</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Cost: $2,538,049

Staffing: Sworn — 170; Civilian — 33; Total — 203.

Criminal Justice Interface

The Criminal Justice Interface Division is charged with the responsibility of providing legal services to the Chief of Police and his staff. Additionally, this division provides liaison and coordination with the Office of the City Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, and courts in Dallas County.

Consultative legal advice is also provided for police officers in the enforcement divisions on matters relating to legal problems. All criminal investigation reports filed with the Office of the Dallas County District Attorney, except traffic cases, are reviewed by attorneys assigned to this division prior to filing.

This division also furnishes assistance to the Training Division in preparation of law subjects training materials and provides teaching services to basic, advanced and specialized training programs.

The activities performed by the division in 1972-73 have been substantially increased with the approval of an IMPACT funding grant, entitled "Legal Aides to Police." This funding provided for the hiring of four Assistant City Attorneys for assignment to the Division to: increase legal assistance to members of the department, provide for a pre-filing review of all criminal cases filed with the Office of the District Attorney, except traffic cases, and to develop an increased training capability in legal subjects. The District Attorney's Liaison Unit was also transferred to the Division as a part of the IMPACT program. The funding for these increased program activities is by an IMPACT grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U. S. Department of Justice. Initial funding was for the period March 1, 1973 — February 28, 1974. Second and third year continuation funding will be requested.

Operating Cost: $77,168. Staffing: Sworn — 6; Civilian — 1; Total — 7.

Data Processing Section

The Data Processing Section within the Support Services Bureau of the Police Department is responsible for designing computer systems for the Department that will assist in more effective law enforcement. This section acts as an interface between the Police Department and the Department of Data Services, by defining Police data processing requirements and overseeing
the implementation of police-oriented computer systems. Regional members of the North Central Texas Crime Information Center also interface with this section for solutions to various problems.

**Work Program Trends:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Systems Definition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Maintenance Performed</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special One Time Action Request</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports Distributed</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Locator File Maintenance</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Sessions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Use</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Capabilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Program Specs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Identification Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned (CIS)</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours and Explanation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Assist Dispatch and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Info System</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis and Solutions</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaces With Other Agencies</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NCTCIC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detention Services Division**

The Detention Services Bureau provides care, transportation, and security of all prisoners arrested by the Police Department of the City of Dallas. As part of this care, prisoners are served meals, furnished medical attention, and afforded an opportunity to have their clothing cleaned.

**Work Program Trends:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners Detained</td>
<td>80,406</td>
<td>88,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals Served</td>
<td>269,420</td>
<td>296,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Prisoner Count</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drug Abuse Division**

The Division’s primary responsibility involves leading the department’s education and enforcement effort directed at drug sellers and users.
Non-drug related activities have been transferred back to this Division. These are the Vice activities, which include Prostitution, Pandering, Procuring and Felony Gambling.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrests for Drug Law Violations</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education Presentations</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Arrests</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $533,671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 36; Civilian — 11; Total — 47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Affairs**

The Fiscal Affairs Division supports the department’s operations by coordinating and preparing the police payroll and annual operating budget, performing purchasing activities, providing continual budget analysis, and conducting the fiscal administration of federal grants.

Operating Cost: $86,645

Staffing: Sworn — 0; Civilian — 11; Total — 11.

**Helicopter Section Air Patrol**

The Helicopter Section, Patrol Bureau, is responsible for furnishing airborne police officers to patrol the City of Dallas to prevent crime, coordinate with ground forces in the apprehension of criminals, and detecting hazards and searching for lost persons. The Section also furnishes air support to all city departments and responds to calls within the city and outside the city in the event of an emergency.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Police Calls Answered</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Flown for Other City Departments</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrest Assists</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Flight Hours (Total)</td>
<td>5,005.1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time To Calls for Service</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $329,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 20; Civilian — 8; Total — 28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identification Section**

The Identification Section of the Technical Services Division is comprised of three functions. One function is responsible for the collection and preservation of evidence from major crime scenes; the processing and submittal of evidence to the Dallas County Institute of Forensic Sciences, to be used in criminal prosecution; the evaluation and screening of criminal suspects and applicants for employment through Polygraph examinations; process and print photographs for use as evidence and internal distribution. The second function is responsible for the establishing of new and updating of old criminal records and to keep available data and information...
current; check the true identity of all criminal suspects and employment applicants through finger printing; forward criminal identifiers to other agencies; process requests for previous arrests of criminals and applicants for employment. The third function is responsible for the collection and maintenance of records, coding and filing of all offense reports, arrest work sheets, jail dispositions, prosecution reports, prisoner activity work sheets and micro-filming of criminal records.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime Scene Searches and Evidence Handled</td>
<td>119,964</td>
<td>122,470</td>
<td>125,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Fingerprinted and Related Material Handled</td>
<td>203,209</td>
<td>233,793</td>
<td>247,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Maintained and Related Material Handled</td>
<td>554,267</td>
<td>561,267</td>
<td>569,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $712,238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 32; Civilian — 45; Total — 77.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspections Division

The Inspections Division conducts departmental studies and inspections to assess all aspects of police operations and recommend proposals that will improve the use of departmental resources.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Inspection Reports Prepared</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $124,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 7; Civilian — 2; Total — 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intelligence Division

The Intelligence Division is concerned with ascertaining the existence of organized crime, its operators, its leadership, and its future planned in-roads into this city. Further, this division monitors subversive groups and individuals who pose a present threat or a future threat to the peace and unity of this city. Another major responsibility of this division is to investigate major business frauds and swindles. Also, security is provided for governmental officials, and for certain government functions. Further, liaison with the field units of the department is maintained through the Field Liaison Section. Finally, intelligence information is maintained and furnished to units of this department and to outside law enforcement agencies.

Operating Cost: $748,584
| Staffing: Sworn — 55; Civilian — 7; Total — 62. |

Internal Affairs Division

The Internal Affairs Division investigates all complaints of misconduct originated by citizens, or within the Police Department against any employee of the Police Department. The results of the investigation are transmitted, with recommendations, to departmental management for action.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Complaint Investigations</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Originating from within department</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originating outside the department</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $120,404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 7; Civilian — 2; Total — 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patrol Bureau

There are five patrol divisions within the department who have the responsibility for the prevention of crime and the maintenance of order through deployment of a force assigned to each of the divisions on a 24-hour basis. Patrol officers respond to all calls for police service, make preliminary investigations at all crime scenes and traffic accidents, perform investigations and followup of most misdemeanors, apprehend offenders and give aid and information to citizens as required.

The following is an analysis of each division:

CENTRAL DIVISION

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Police Service</td>
<td>29,998</td>
<td>28,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time (minutes)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests Made</td>
<td>22,860</td>
<td>23,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $2,434,665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 209; Civilian — 4; Total — 213.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NORTHEAST DIVISION

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Police Service</td>
<td>90,079</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time (Minutes)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests Made</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $1,952,757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 155; Civilian — 6; Total — 161.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOUTHEAST DIVISION

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Police Service</td>
<td>84,240</td>
<td>96,876</td>
<td>111,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>15,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $3,376,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 280; Civilian — 10; Total — 290.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOUTHWEST DIVISION

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Police Service</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time (minutes)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests Made</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Citations Issued</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $1,785,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 146; Civilian — 6; Total — 152.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NORTHWEST DIVISION

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Police Service</td>
<td>78,743</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time (minutes)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests Made</td>
<td>21,441</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost:</td>
<td>$2,377,546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 198; Civilian — 6; Total — 204.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Division

The Personnel Division's activities include the maintenance of personnel records, recruitment of police applicants, conduct of background investigations, and handling of all employee relations matters.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Interviewed</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Investigated</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Appointments</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Appointments</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost:</td>
<td>$512,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 32; Civilian — 9; Total — 41.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning and Research Division

The Planning and Research Section studies current crime problems to determine and recommend the appropriate operational response, prepares departmental policy directives, conducts advanced planning for future police programs, and coordinates departmental grants-in-aid programs.

Operating Cost: $171,481

Staffing: Sworn — 9; Civilian — 12; Total — 21.

Property Division

The Property Division is responsible for the custody, care and control of all owned Department property, including weapons, uniforms, equipment and furniture. This Division shall also administer and control, transport or tow and store non-Department property, such as contraband, found, stolen and bulky evidence.

Work Program Trends:

1. Facilities Controller
   - Telephone requests ................................................. 50
   - Police and Courts Building ...................................... Renovation
   - Locker Room at Southeast Sub ................................... Building
2. Property Control Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoices written and distributed</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index cards prepared</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistol destructions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public auctions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General destructions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund deposits</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUARTERMASTER UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniform and Equipment Invoices</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Receipt and Return form</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbished equipment</td>
<td>24 pcs</td>
<td>30 pcs</td>
<td>40 pcs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Automobile Pound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units impounded</td>
<td>37,517</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles delivered</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles auctioned</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Cost: $973,733

Staffing: Sworn — 6; Civilian — 70; Total — 76.

**Report Section**

Activities of the Technical Services Division include operating the department’s radio communication system; reviewing and distributing of police reports; supplying expert testimony in courts; studying crime problems and recommending appropriate operational responses; preparing policy directions; coordinating grants-in-aid programs; and designing computer systems for the department that will assist in more effective law enforcement.

**Work Program Trends:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records Maintained</td>
<td>815,000</td>
<td>940,000</td>
<td>890,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Cost: $979,396

Staffing: Sworn — 15; Civilian — 95; Total — 110.

**Special Operations Division**

The Tactical Section is the main striking force of the Special Operations Division. This section supplements the regular Special Services Bureau forces by providing additional manpower above that normally required to handle unusual conditions.

III-11
The Alcohol and License Section of the Special Operations Division is responsible for the investigation of applicants and locations and the issuance of licenses to trouble free locations and to persons of reputable character who own or who participate in the operation of massage parlors, billiard halls, dance halls, and all businesses which deal in any way in the sale or distribution of alcoholic beverage; consistent inspection of these locations and the enforcement of all laws and ordinances in and around them; the control of bootlegging; the curtailing of obscenity and pornography violations; the control of homosexual activities; with the ultimate goal of the protection of the dignity, welfare, health, peace, temperance, and safety of the people of the city.

The Special Events Planning Unit of the Special Operations Division is responsible for preparing all operational plans which utilize personnel from the Special Operations Division and/or Special Services Bureau personnel and, on occasions, personnel from other bureaus’ divisions.

The Special Assignments Unit of the Special Operations Division is responsible for the following:

A. Investigate persons applying for a state license to operate private detective agencies and private patrol agencies, fill in the appropriate blanks on their applications and write letters to the Texas Board of Private Investigators and Private Security Agencies, informing them of the prior arrest record of any applicant.

B. Investigate persons applying to register with the Texas Board of Private Investigators and Private Security Agencies, as Investigators or Corporation Officers, fill in their applications and write letters as in A above.

C. Investigate Street Patrol Special Officer and Private Guard Applicants, write memorandums to the City Manager recommending approval of those who quality and disapproval of those who do not quality.

D. Investigate persons applying for Motor Vehicle Escort Service Licenses and Motor Vehicle Escort Guide City Chauffeurs’ Licenses. Issue licenses to those who qualify and write memorandums to the City Manager recommending disapproval of those who do not qualify.

E. Enforcing the laws and ordinances governing the above persons and agencies by conducting field inspections, investigating all complaints against these persons and filing appropriate court cases against those found in violation of the laws and ordinances.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Events Worked</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Problems Worked</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pornography — cases filed</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law — arrests</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent-Obscene Conduct</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Solicitation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornication &amp; Seduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Abortion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigamy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issuance of Licenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance hall</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance hall supervisors</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed beverage</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage Parlor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiard halls</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Locations Inspected</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>3,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parades</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Games</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathons</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rallies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest Marches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fair of Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas-Oklahoma Rally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commissions Issued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971</th>
<th>Estimated 1972</th>
<th>Estimated 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissions Issued</td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants for Commissions Rejected</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants for State License and Registration</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Arrested for Alias Tickets and Other Charges</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Contacts on Field Inspections</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Filed as Result of Field Inspections</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauffeur's License Issued</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Escort Agency Applicants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Court Bailiffs Furnished for Municipal Court (man days) (This function is being phased out and strength will be reduced by one patrolman at that time.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971</th>
<th>Actual 1972</th>
<th>Estimated 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Police Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971</th>
<th>Actual 1972</th>
<th>Estimated 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>10,133</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhours</td>
<td>53,505</td>
<td>50,665</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Cost: $1,707,411

Staffing: Sworn — 125; Civilian — 4; Total — 129.
Traffic Division Operations

Police Officers from the Traffic Division investigate all fatal and serious injury traffic accidents, enforce traffic laws, administer parking and intersection control, conduct school crosswalk safety programs, and supervise school crossing guards.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Accidents Investigated</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Accidents Investigated</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Citations Issued</td>
<td>74,900</td>
<td>82,400</td>
<td>89,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crosswalks Assigned</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Injury Accidents Investigated</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $3,228,649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staffing: Sworn — 189; Civilian — 43; Total — 232.

Training and Education Division

All training activities in the Police Department are supervised and coordinated by the Training and Education Division. The primary responsibilities of the division include training of recruit officers, administering advanced and specialized in-service and firearms training programs, coordinating training colleges and institutes, and supervising the cadet program. The Division maintains training records both sworn and non-sworn and records of college hours for incentive pay.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1971-72</th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruits Trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sworn</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Training Hours Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn</td>
<td>123,840</td>
<td>129,600</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sworn</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>9,494</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-House Specialized</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Coordinated Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Hours Received</td>
<td>32,976</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Enrolled in College</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet Program Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Instruction Hours</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $521,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staffing: Sworn — 20; Civilian — 47; Total — 67.
Youth Division

The Youth Division processes and counsels all arrested juveniles. In addition, it provides followup investigation on arrested youths, and conducts preventive patrol surveillance to identify and effectively cope with juvenile hangouts. This division maintains liaison between the Dallas Police Department, Dallas Independent School District, Dallas County Juvenile Department, juvenile courts, and other community youth agencies. The division investigates all missing persons and runaway juvenile reports, in addition to operating the School-Community Guidance centers and conducting the First Offender Program.

Work Program Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 1972-73</th>
<th>Estimated 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Arrested</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truants Counseled</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Offenders</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway Juveniles apprehended</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost: $783,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing: Sworn — 60; Civilian — 6; Total — 66.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Equipment and Facilities

Helicopters: 6

Equipment:
- 110 — 12-Gauge Pump Shotguns
- 100 — Canister Type Gas Masks
- 17 — 37mm Gas Guns
- 9 — Bomb Disposal Jackets

Riot Equipment:
- 115 — Riot Batons
- 110 — Helmets and Accessories
- 74 — Armored Vests
- 24 — 12-Gauge Gas Launchers
- 9 — 6mm Anti-Sniper Rifles

Vehicles:
- 684 — Total
- 460 — Marked
- 224 — Unmarked

Facilities:
- 5 — District Stations
- 1 — Headquarters Station
- 1 — Firing Range
- 1 — Police Academy
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(3) **Capabilities and Response Time**

Total clearance rate for Index crimes was 27.05 percent in 1971 and 27.83 percent in 1972. Slight increases were realized in clearances for burglary, larceny, auto theft, and rape. Clearances for aggravated assaults increased 4 percent; clearances for robberies increased 7 percent; and clearances for murder decreased from 96.62 percent in 1971 to 91.67 percent in 1972.

Table III-1 represents these capabilities for 1972 Index crimes and felony narcotics. Table III-2 represents total arrests in 1972.

The following response times were obtained from an analysis of signals over a ten-month period in 1972:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal</th>
<th>Dispatch Time</th>
<th>Total Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery, Holdup Alarm</td>
<td>1.7 Minutes</td>
<td>4.4 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary, Burglary Alarm</td>
<td>2.8 Minutes</td>
<td>9.0 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Assault Cutting, Shooting</td>
<td>2.5 Minutes</td>
<td>7.0 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dallas Police Department received 364,955 calls for service during 1972. This averaged 456 calls per patrol officer. Table III-3 lists the patrol capabilities for the department.

(4) **Resource Needs**

(a) **Recruitment**

There is a definite need for college educated persons to be recruited as law enforcement personnel. It is felt that the knowledge, as well as greater social awareness and understanding, derived through higher education are assets that are extremely desirable in law enforcement officers.

The number of college graduates within the department has increased from 20 in 1970 to 245 in 1973. In addition, the average semester hours per officer has increased from 18 hours in 1970 to 60 hours in 1973.

Coupled with the need for college educated personnel is the need to attract members of minority groups into law enforcement. They are invaluable in that they can interface with juvenile minority offenders and assist in the prevention of community tensions. These people can offer assistance in reduction of community tensions, crime reduction, and the alleviation of the drug abuse problem.

There is a lack of professional personnel to screen, test, and counsel juveniles. This growing problem must be met by recruiting qualified personnel. Assistance of the citizens of the community also needs to be recruited. Volunteers are needed to support work with juveniles to provide guidance and employment opportunities.

(b) **Training**

Recruit training programs should be expanded to insure that officers are provided with the most modern, efficient training that can be devised. As the educational level of recruits rises, more innovative and professional training should become available. This will have a direct effect on our ability to reduce Index offenses and control crime.

There is also a need for improved in-service training within law enforcement agencies. The more modern and complex an organization becomes, the more it should be able to train its supervisory and administrative personnel in managerial and specialty skills. These supervisory and specialist positions must be filled with people who have undergone the necessary training to enable them to carry out the duties of their jobs competently and efficiently.

Training programs must be established to prevent and control crime as well as informing and training personnel in specialized fields. Improved procedures aimed at prevention and
TABLE III-1
City of Dallas
Police Department Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Offenses</th>
<th>Number of Arrests</th>
<th>Cases Filed</th>
<th>Number of Clearances by Arrest</th>
<th>Clearance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>66.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>37.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>22.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggr. Assault</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>78.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/Dr.</td>
<td>10,481</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>13.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Dallas Police Department
### TABLE III-2

City of Dallas
Total 1972 Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Total Arrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I Offenses</td>
<td>11,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II Offenses</td>
<td>44,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic (Including Citations)</td>
<td>244,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

### TABLE III-3

City of Dallas
Patrol Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Patrol</th>
<th>Day Shift</th>
<th>Evening Shift</th>
<th>Night Shift</th>
<th>Other Shifts*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One man vehicle</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two man vehicle</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One man foot</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two man foot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Patrols</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents Special Operations Division, Tactical Section

SOURCE: Dallas Police Department
control of juvenile delinquency is an example of a specialized area where training could play an important role.

The area of personnel administration presents another need. Problems dealing with selection, assignments, ratings and evaluations, discipline, promotion, and career development, must be dealt with through means of an effective system.

(c) Equipment

The rising crime problem can be met not only by a modern, well-trained force but by providing them with new and innovative equipment. Some of the areas that could benefit by advanced equipment are communications, records, and data processing. Program dealing with drug abuse are inadequate. Better equipped facilities are necessary for treatment. It should be borne in mind that even as the quality of personnel improves, technical improvements must also be made in order to enable the personnel to adequately perform their duties.

(d) Police - Community Relations

A major requirement to effectively combat crime in the community is active awareness and involvement of the citizenry. The police cannot do it alone. It is the responsibility of the police to pierce citizen apathy and motivate just such involvement. The Dallas Police Department has met with some success in the area of public education and involvement through Operation Get Involved, a network of interaction between police and citizen through structured, community-based "beat" committees. As an outlet for crime education and prevention programs, the Department has been able to effectively disseminate information through the committee and receive citizen input.

But more resources are necessary to carry the community relations program even further if ultimate police objectives are to be attained. There must be an on-going effort to carry crime prevention to where it is most needed — into the home and the business. There is a need for greater interaction between police and citizen on as close to a one-to-one basis as possible. If the homeowner or businessman is to be made aware of how he can better protect himself against victimization, hazards must be specifically pointed out to him and alternative means of enhanced protection made available.

Expansion of this interaction does not stop with prevention of victimization. Community crime prevention also entails deterrence of would-be offenders, such as potential delinquents and young people absorbed by an unhealthy environment. In order to improve the police image, and at the same time encourage lifestyle choices which do not lead to criminal careers, the police should seek to provide suitable alternatives to criminal behavior, whether through organized athletics, strong personal relationships, or other approaches. Resources and programs are needed in this area also.

As the mutual commitment of police and community resources to a safer environment is strengthened, the experience of such a partnership should lead to the most effective crime prevention, community problem-solving posture conceivably possible in any similar-sized city.

b. GARLAND POLICE DEPARTMENT

(1) Capabilities and Resources

Table III-4 represents the department's capabilities in dealing with 1972 Index crimes and felony narcotics.

The budget for fiscal year 1972 was $1,607,005.

(2) Manpower

Department operations are divided into Police and Public Safety activities. Police operations include Patrol, Criminal Investigation, Support Services, and Special Services Divisions (total 97 sworn officer personnel).
### TABLE III-4

City of Garland

Police Department Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Offenses</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Aggr. Assault</th>
<th>T/Oe.</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>Felony Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance by Arrest Rate</td>
<td>166%</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Safety operations are supportive to police activities and include clerical and secretarial support for all department personnel; animal control attendants; school crossing and jail guards; dispatchers; records clerks; a community service officer; and one Planning and Analysis Unit position (total 64 full and part-time personnel). Part-time public safety positions are also available to college students majoring in police administration, sociology or related fields (six positions — summer help), and to high school students (one position — vocational education).

The Planning and Analysis Unit authorized in the Department’s operating budget is part of the newly created Special Services Division. Unit functions include department manpower and resource planning, organizational studies, and analysis of department services, operating procedures, and policies. Intelligence, recruiting and training are also part of the Special Services Division.

Under a recently approved application for Action Grant assistance from the Texas Criminal Justice Council, funds were provided to expand the department’s Crime Prevention Education Unit by the addition of one full-time officer to its current staff of two officers. The Crime Prevention Education Unit has been combined with the Youth Services Bureau for supervisory and administrative purposes.

The department and each of its divisions is organized on a 24-hour basis of three shifts with adequate staffing to provide necessary relief shifts for ranking officers and Patrol Division personnel.

(3) Training

Police training is coordinated through the Special Services Division. Apprentice police officers receive basic training at the North Central Texas Council of Governments’ Academy at Arlington, Texas. The department has its own certified police academy for in-service training.

Department policy dictates each officer will receive a minimum of forty hours in-service training per year. This does not include periodic firearms qualification or roll-call training bulletins, which are distributed bi-monthly.

The training officer of the department hold a class “A” Instructor’s Certificate from the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education. In addition, the department also has fifteen in-house class “B” instructors. Average training of current sworn personnel includes 599 hours of in-service training and 33 college hours.

(4) Police Response Time

Response times have been compiled by dividing the calls for service into three categories: emergency calls, Part I offense calls and non-priority or miscellaneous calls. Response times are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Average Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency calls</td>
<td>3.56 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I Offense Calls</td>
<td>7.31 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Calls</td>
<td>7.70 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time</td>
<td>6.19 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Emergency calls include:

- Murder
- Shootings
- Cuttings
- Major Accidents
- Major Fire Calls
- Injured Persons (First Aid Required)
- Attempt Suicide
- Rape in Progress
- Robbery in Progress
- Burglary in Progress
- House Fire

Priority calls include:

- Robbery (not in progress)
- Burglary (not in progress)
- Theft in Progress
- Suicide
- Disturbance in Progress
- Prowler or Suspicious Person Observed
- Affray
- Assault in Progress
- Missing or Lost Small Children
- Minor Accident
- Rape and All Sex Offenses
- Signal Light Malfunction
- Burglar Alarms
- Deaths (Unattended)
- Fires (Other than House)

Non-priority calls include:

- Motor Vehicle Disturbances
- Simple Assault (Not in Progress)
- Bicycle Theft
- Animal Complaints and Bites
  (Times on a bite should be used only when an officer makes the report)
- Delayed Disturbances
- Information
- Runaway and Missing Persons
- Telephone Disturbances
- Malicious Mischief
- Abandoned Vehicles and Lost and Found
- Embezzlements and Fraud
- Narcotics
- Vice
- Driving While Intoxicated, Driving with License Suspended, and
  Driving Under the Influence of Drugs
- Theft (not in progress)
- Injured Persons (no first aid required)
- Emergency Message
In 1969 the facility which now houses both the Garland Municipal Court and Police Department was completed. The combining of Police and Municipal Court activities in the same building has proved to be functional, and has increased the operating efficiency of the city's criminal justice system. This facility also provides adequate space for the storage of abandoned property, recovered stolen property, and other items that require safe keeping.

The department presently has 37 cars and one van truck in service. Of this number, 18 vehicles are marked squad cars. The marked units are equipped with visabar emergency lights, electronic sirens, public address system, 4-channel band radios, riot guns, prisoner security screens, and first aid equipment. The van truck is outfitted as a mobile crime scene search unit and mobile command post.

The department utilizes a polygraph and currently has two qualified operators. Polygraph examinations are made by these operators on a need basis. This facility is utilized for criminal cases and pre-employment purposes. It is also available to other law enforcement agencies for criminal cases, including Police Departments, District Attorney's Office, Sheriff's Office and others.

The department is equipped with a “Detroit Bullet Trap,” five stall, 50-foot, indoor pistol range. This range is completely electronically controlled, giving the capability of producing field conditions. This facility is available for use by other law enforcement agencies on an appointment basis.

The Communications Center monitors and has broadcast capability on six radio channels. These four high band and two low band channels are housed in a radio console unit. Closed circuit T.V. is available for monitoring jail activity by communications personnel. Department surveillance capabilities also include video tape monitoring equipment.

In recent periods, new operating systems have been implemented by the department to better serve the Garland community. A microfilm record storage and retrieval system has been acquired by the department to upgrade its information processing capabilities. Other administrative enhancements include an automated work processing unit designed to increase the efficiency of department public safety clerical support personnel.

The department presently is operating an IBM 1052 computer terminal connected with the Dallas Police Department. This terminal gives immediate access to the Regional Wanted Persons File, and is interphased with the National Crime Information Center in Washington, D.C. The department is also operating a Courier computer terminal attached to the Dallas County Sheriff's Department Criminal Record File. Available in this system are records of arrests, and judicial information pertaining to court docket, charge, court numbers, dispositions of cases, and other pertinent data involving records. The department is also installing an IBM 3270 terminal for use in the City of Garland IBM 370-135 Computer System. Presently, all criminal records and intelligence data are stored on discs retrievable within this system. The police records are duplicated on magnetic tape and placed in the Dallas County Sheriff's Office Criminal File. This dual record information system provides the department with an on-line record retrieval possibility and a back-up system in the event of computer failure by either system. Current planning is to interphase the Dallas County System with The Texas Crime Information Center in Austin. Presently, the department operates a LETS teletypewriter to enter this system. Criminal history, wanted persons, stolen property, license plates, and Texas drivers license information is available for department personnel through the teletype system.
(7) Inter-Agency Cooperation

Monthly reports containing data on robbery, burglary, murder, rape, aggravated assault, larceny, auto theft, narcotics, and other crimes are compiled, maintained and submitted by the department to the FBI, Texas Department of Public Safety, and the National Safety Council.

The department has assigned a Detective Patrolman to the Dallas Metro Squad, and participates actively in Dallas County criminal investigation operations.

The department has also implemented a computer identification system in cooperation with other law enforcement agencies in North Central Texas for the identification, numbering and recording of personal property.

(8) Standards Governing Appointments to the Police Force

Age requirements:
Applicants must be at least 21 years of age and not have reached their 36th birthday at the time of appointment.

Height and Weight:
Minimum of 5'8"; maximum of 6'5". Weight must be in proportion to height.

Physical Examination:
Applicant must pass rigid physical examination; have vision of 20/40 uncorrected and must not be colorblind.

Education:
High school graduate.

Past Background:
Must be able to stand a rigid background investigation, including credit and fingerprint check. Background will be verified by polygraph examination.

Testing:
Must achieve a passing grade on a civil service examination and comply with an established psychological profile.

(9) Public Opinion Regarding Crime in Garland

The Garland Police Department has recently expanded its Crime Prevention Education Unit to include the implementation of a community awareness program. This program will involve meetings with various community business, civic, and service groups; elementary and secondary school children; professional associations; and residents of those areas of Garland found to be highly susceptible to criminal activity. One result of these meetings will be the development of a capability by the police department to accurately assess community opinions and concerns regarding each of the Index crimes discussed above. Consequently, relevant data on public opinion of crime in Garland, while not available at this time, will be available for analysis during future planning periods.

c. GRAND PRAIRIE POLICE DEPARTMENT

(1) Manpower and Resources

There are 52 sworn officers and 18 civilian personnel in the department.

The 1972-73 police budget is $830,237, with $626,667 (75.5 percent) used for salaries. The prospect of obtaining an additional tax base to allow further increases in available funding is not bright at present due to heavy demands for other municipal services. The police budget represents approximately 11 percent of the total city budget this year.
The administrative ability of the department is reflected by several barometers. It is felt that the relatively high clearance rate experienced by the department during the last several years (53 percent for Part I and II offenses in 1972) is indication that the personnel are guided by a degree of expertise. However, administratively it is felt that increasing demands on resources are creating a situation of defensive rather than offensive action. Taking care of today's problems is given priority over properly analyzing current activity in order to take remedial action soon enough to be effective even in the immediate future. There is a lack of time for planning for the months ahead. This, it is realized, is not good administrative policy, but a proverbial side-effect of our metropolitan situation. Lines of supervision and their span of control are at maximum effective range.

(2) Capabilities

Table III-5 represents the department's capabilities in dealing with 1972 Index crimes and felony narcotics.

Requests for police services increased during the year by 11 percent. Arrests increased over the previous year by 13 percent. Juvenile arrests increased 35 percent during the year. Analysis of previous data indicates this rising trend to be apparent for the last several years as the city has experienced growth in population and population density.

Due to the increased demands on police services, without a proportionate increase in workforce, response time is increasing. During 1971, citizens' requests for service — delayed five minutes or more in dispatch due to lack of available unassigned squads — were 4.9 percent of all radio calls. In 1972, statistics indicate that 5.6 percent of all requests for service were delayed, and for the first two months of 1972 these delayed calls for service were averaging 7.4 percent.

Table III-6 reflects the total arrests by the department during 1972.

(3) Training

Officer training is primarily limited to the initial training given new recruits. When schedules allow, experienced officers are enrolled for additional refresher courses at the North Central Texas Regional Police Academy. There is a strong need in the department for additional training, perhaps on an in-service basis, in order to maintain effectiveness.

(4) Resource Needs

The department's ability to respond effectively to combating crime can be measured in several ways. First, inadequate patrol techniques prevent the assignment of unit to specific areas showing high incidence of burglaries and thefts. This is due to the fact that these units must answer and be available for routine radio calls. The department needs to have at its command, personnel to deploy into specific high-incident areas to enable preventive patrol techniques and increased apprehension rates.

The department has recently added 11 station personnel required to man its new police facility, which was occupied for the first time during February, 1973. There remains the need for additional manpower within the department to address the rising crime problems and response time that has increased in the past three years. The projected growth in population indicates that the problems experienced in the past will continue to multiply if positive remedial action is not taken.
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TABLE III-5  
City of Grand Prairie  
Police Department Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Offenses</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Aggr. Assault</th>
<th>T/Ov.</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>Felony Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance by Arrest Rate</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35% (filed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III-6
City of Grand Prairie
Total 1972 Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Arrests</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Arrests</td>
<td>4,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Traffic Arrests</td>
<td>7,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. MESQUITE POLICE DEPARTMENT

(1) Manpower and Resources

The department employed 84 officers during 1972, an increase of 12 compared to 1971. Total expenditures for 1972 were $897,468.

(2) Capabilities and Response Time

Table III-7 represents the capabilities of the department in dealing with Index crimes and drug violations during 1972.

A total of 2,050 adults and 887 juveniles were arrested during 1972. The department responded to 1,556 total motor vehicle accidents during 1972, of which 363 involved injuries and 14 involved fatalities. In total, the department responded to 20,476 radio calls during the year.

An analysis of response time was made for the month of May. In summary, this data reflected the following:

Total calls by district and average response time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Calls</th>
<th>Average Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 70</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>12.5 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 71</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>11.7 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 72</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>10.9 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 73</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>7.7 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 74</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>10.3 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 75</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>10.6 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Calls</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Response Time</td>
<td>10.6 Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busiest Time Period</td>
<td>4 p.m. to 11 p.m. (888 calls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Resource Needs

The need to reduce response time is evident. With the demands for police service being greater in 1972 than ever before, the need to improve patrol, deployment, and overall efficiency is imperative. In addition, there is a need for a "Research and Planning Unit." It has been discovered, chiefly through preparation of this year's criminal justice plan, that raw data by itself will not work as a tool in manpower deployment. There is a demonstrated need for a Research and Planning Office to analyze and plan from collected data. This added capability would greatly enhance the ability of the department to utilize its resources and manpower to its full potential.

Also needed is technical equipment, such as a color photo lab to aid the police investigator with color mug shots for victim identification, as well as a microfilm retrieval system. Both improvements would increase the department's ability to detect, identify, and apprehend offenders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>T/Ow.</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual No. of Offenses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance by Arrest Rate</td>
<td>166%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER DALLAS COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENTS

The following is a listing of the personnel strengths and 1972 budgets for 12 of the larger remaining cities within Dallas County:

1. **Carrollton Police Department**
   - Total Officers: 29
   - 1972-73 Approved Budget: $377,440

2. **Cockrell Hill Police Department**
   - Total Department: 14 (Including Part-time)
   - 1972 Budget: $77,398

3. **DeSoto Police Department**
   - Total Department: 20
   - 1972 Budget: $143,505

4. **Duncanville Police Department**
   - Total Officers: 20
   - 1971-72 Estimated Budget: $214,602

5. **Farmers Branch Police Department**
   - Total Department: 42
   - 1971-72 Budget: $567,183

6. **Highland Park Police Department**
   - Total Department: 28 sworn, 2 civilian
   - 1972 Budget: $387,156

7. **Hutchins Police Department**
   - Total Department: 14 (2 full-time), 12 reserves
   - 1972 Budget: $25,000

8. **Irving Police Department**
   - Total Officers: 106
   - Other Personnel: 23
   - 1972 Budget: $1,300,000

9. **Lancaster Police Department**
   - Total Department: 16 (includes 4 female dispatchers)
   - 1972 Budget: $141,000

10. **Richardson Police Department**
    - Total Personnel: 77
    - 1972 Budget: $865,000

11. **Seagoville Police Department**
    - Total Officers: 3
    - 1972-73 Budget: $33,662

12. **University Park Police Department**
    - Total Officers: 30
    - 1972 Budget: $422,124
f. DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

The duties of the Dallas County Sheriff’s Office include operation of the county jail facilities, broad enforcement responsibilities throughout the county, and general information services to law enforcement agencies through the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).

Figure III-2 sets forth the organizational chart for this department. Listed below are general duties of the major divisions in the Sheriff's Office.

**Patrol Division**

All unincorporated areas of Dallas County are the responsibility of the patrol division. The area is divided into districts and the patrol cars travel over 10,000 miles each month, averaging about 550 calls in these periods. The patrol usually is the first law enforcement officer on the scene and must respond as the situation warrants.

**Criminal Investigation Division**

Criminal Investigation officers are highly trained in crime detection through long experience, specialized education or both. Education of at least high school level is required along with at least two years experience as a patrolman. Additionally, these officers attend police schools and seminars. They must have a knowledge of court operations and of the laws of the city, county, state and nation. They are trained interrogators, familiar with crime laboratory operations, and understand the procedures of polygraph testing.

**Warrant Division**

The Warrant Division is comprised of outside investigators, clerks, and supervisors. The duties of this division are to execute the warrants issued by the criminal district courts, county criminal courts, and Justice of the Peace courts. 59,791 warrants were received (all categories) in 1972 and 54,793 were executed.

**Fugitive Division**

Basically, a fugitive is a person charged with a criminal offense who is attempting to evade arrest. Fugitives can be classified in two categories: The person charged with the commission of a crime in Texas who flees to another state, and the person who flees to Dallas County to avoid prosecution for a crime committed in another state. Following arrest of the fugitive it is this division's responsibility to take whatever legal action is necessary to bring about return of the person to the locality where the alleged crime was committed.

**Bond Desk**

When a person is arrested and comes under the custody of the Sheriff's Department that action starts a series of record keeping that follows the individual involved until the charge against him is disposed of by imposition of a sentence or by grand jury no-bill or by an action in court. The Bond Desk serves as a “clearinghouse” to insure that all proper papers are instituted in this step-by-step process. Close liaison with the criminal and justice of the peace courts is mandatory. Additionally, the Bond Desk has responsibility for all papers having to do with the making of bonds which bring about the release of arrested persons pending Grand Jury or court action. It is the responsibility of the Sheriff to accept or to reject the surety on any bond. He may set a bond if no Judge or Justice of the Peace is available.

**Civil Division**

Operations of the Civil Division include service of all court orders having to do with civil matters. These papers can include divorce citations, temporary restraining orders, subpoenas, garnishments, and sequestrations.
FIGURE III-2
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Fiscal Affairs Department

This department compiles and prepares the Dallas County Sheriff's Office annual budget, handles all matters pertaining to the payroll of the DSO. Preparation of court orders for new employees. Each new employee's application must be passed on by the County Commissioner's Court. The Division requisitions or purchases all office supplies, distributes Special Fund Checks from General Fund, writes receipts for all money received in DSO, from jail fines, cash bonds, etc. balances, codes and deposits all monies received in DSO, makes all purchases for food for county jail.

The Sheriff's Department furnishes Bailiffs for County Courts. A bailiff is a Deputy Sheriff, a Court Officer, who executes writs, processes, restraints and arrests, and acts as a messenger or usher in the Court.

The assignment of sworn personnel and the amount budgeted in 1973 for each category is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Sworn Personnel</th>
<th>1973 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Sergeant</td>
<td>$189,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Officers</td>
<td>27,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Dispatcher</td>
<td>59,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiffs</td>
<td>340,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil, Outside</td>
<td>190,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil, Execution</td>
<td>35,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Investigators</td>
<td>343,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Officers</td>
<td>343,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrolmen</td>
<td>438,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jailers and Matrons</td>
<td>583,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D. Officers</td>
<td>147,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-In Officers</td>
<td>46,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Agents</td>
<td>36,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Sequestration</td>
<td>91,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Supervisor</td>
<td>36,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chit</td>
<td>9,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Supervisors</td>
<td>47,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Book-In</td>
<td>22,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Desk</td>
<td>31,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Desk</td>
<td>29,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnkey</td>
<td>124,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddy Wagon</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagoville Substation</td>
<td>9,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Inspection</td>
<td>9,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td>9,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Cliff Title Inspection</td>
<td>9,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant, Training</td>
<td>23,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total 1972 appropriation for the department is $6,213,647. This takes into account all personnel and all expenses that this office must incur in the administration of its duties.
B. ADJUDICATION

1. FEDERAL

The adjudication of federal cases is conducted in one of five federal districts courts. While each court is empowered to handle criminal cases, one court usually handles all criminal cases for a six-month interval. Prosecution for each court is handled by the United States Attorney's Office. Cases on appeal pass through the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Jurisdiction for these federal courts is limited to the enforcement of statutes enacted by Congress as found in the United States Criminal Codes.

2. STATE AND LOCAL

Within the Dallas metropolitan area the judicial system functions in both the city and county governmental units. The County Probation Department performs pre-trial investigations and some post trial counseling and supervision. Misdemeanors are tried in Municipal Courts of the city, Justice of Peace courts in the county and county criminal courts. Felonies are tried in criminal districts courts.

a. COUNTY JUDGE

The County Judge is the titular head of County Government. In addition to being an administrator and presiding Judge of the Commissioners Court, he attends many functions and represents the County the same as the Mayor of a City.

Through the Commissioners Court, the County Judge is responsible for the general functions and policy making decisions of County government.

The County Judge approves applications for beer licenses, waivers on mixed drink licenses, and applications for delayed birth certificates must bear his signature before they can be filed for record. The County Judge also can issue marriage waivers and perform the wedding ceremony. He serves on the Election Board, the Juvenile Board, and jointly with the District Judges appoints the Purchasing Agent.

The County Judge is elected county-wide.

b. COUNTY COURTS — AT LAW

Dallas County's County Courts-at-Law have exclusive jurisdiction of civil cases where the amount involved ranges from $200 to $500. They have equal jurisdiction with the district courts of cases involving amounts from $500 to $5,000.

The courts have exclusive jurisdiction of lawsuits involving condemnation of land for public use, and they are the courts of last resort on appeals of eviction cases. The courts also hear appeals on driver license suspensions.

c. COUNTY CRIMINAL COURTS

The jurisdiction of the County Criminal Courts allows the judge thereof to try all criminal misdemeanor cases for which jail time may be assessed as punishment. Maximum penalty for any offense triable in this court is two years in jail and a $1,000 fine. Some of these offenses include aggravated assault, driving while intoxicated, passing worthless checks, theft under $50, shoplifting, possession of dangerous drugs, exhibiting obscene matter, and certain sex crimes. A county Criminal Court Judge is elected County-wide. The four County Criminal Courts had an approximate budget of $276,102 for 1973. These courts processed a total of 16,260 cases, 13,375 (82%) were convictions. A total of 19,187 cases were filed during 1972 with the year end backlog of 10,322 cases. Over $1.7 million was assessed in fines and $2.2 million was collected in fines and costs.

(See Table III-8.)
TABLE III-8
Dispositions by Dallas County Criminal Courts
For 1972*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Convicted</th>
<th>Acquitted</th>
<th>Dismissed</th>
<th>Quashed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.W.I.</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>7,462</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Check</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>749</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying Prohibited Weapon</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All totals do not tally due to transfer, hung juries, etc.
d. DISTRICTS COURTS

Dallas County has twenty-one districts courts, twelve for civil law cases and nine for criminal cases, plus four domestic relations courts and two juvenile courts.

Dallas County's criminal Districts Courts and Civil Districts Courts annually have more dispositions per court than the district courts of any other county in the State.

District Courts are state offices and the judges are state officials. However, Dallas County's district judges, by law, have become an integral part of the county government.

All of the district judges are elected county-wide for four-year terms. The domestic relations courts and juvenile courts are county offices, and, by statute, are paid by the county the same salary as the district judges, who receive state pay with county supplement.

In addition to their judicial responsibilities, the judges engage in a number of administrative services for Dallas County. Such administrative functions include appointing and supervising the County Auditor, Purchasing Agent, and the bailiffs and staff of the Central Jury Room. The judges also appoint the county adult probation officers.

The district judges, domestic relations and juvenile judges and the County Judge comprise the Dallas County Juvenile Board, and supervise the County Juvenile Department.

Dallas County embraces the 14th, 44th, 68th, 95th, 101st, 116th, 134th, 160th, 162nd, 191st, 192nd, and 193rd Judicial District Courts for civil litigation. These general trial jurisdiction courts have original jurisdiction of all cases involving amounts greater than $5,000, and land titles, and concurrent jurisdiction with Domestic Relations Courts 1, 2, 3 and 4, and Juvenile Courts 1 and 2, of divorce, adoption, juvenile cases, and allied matters.

Dallas Criminal District Courts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and the 194th, 195th, 203rd, and 204th Judicial District Courts try felony cases involving offenses for which persons can be sent to the Texas Department of Corrections.

The 203rd and 204th Judicial District Courts were originally created by Impact funds for Impact cases. These two courts are now permanent.

After September 1, 1973, cases will be assigned to the new courts, 203rd and 204th, Judicial District Courts in the same manner that cases are assigned to the other seven Criminal District Courts. This means that the new courts will sponsor Grand Juries and will receive their share of cases from the sponsoring court. The Criminal District Judges, in rotation, currently appoint a grand jury commission that selects a new grand jury every three months. These judges also appoint the bailiffs of the grand jury.

The District Clerk will distribute the Impact cases equally among the nine criminal courts. Additional procedures followed in the assignment of cases are to assign all cases on a defendant to the same court, to divide the number of defendants on bond, in jail, and unapprehended as equally as possible, and to assign a defendant to a court if he is on probation from that court.

In the disposition of cases the following priority is used in scheduling the cases for trial in all nine felony courts.

1. Repeater - Impact offenders who are in the custody of the jail.
2. Repeater - Serious Crime (formally defined as “capital” crime) offenders who are in the custody of the jail.
3. Repeater - Impact offenders who have been released on bond or are otherwise not in custody of the jail.
4. Impact offenders who are in the custody of the jail.
5. Repeat offenders who have been released on bond or are otherwise not in the custody of the jail.

6. Persons who have committed serious crimes whether they be in custody of the jail or released on bond or are otherwise not in the custody of the jail.

7. All other offenders whether they be in custody of the jail or released on bond or are otherwise not in custody of the jail.

This priority scheme is followed whenever facts, circumstances, and feasibility permit.

The repeat offender is defined to include all persons who are arrested and have had a previous felony conviction within the last two years and those who have a charge pending at the time of arrest.

During 1972 the Dallas County Criminal District Courts disposed of a total of 10,218 cases. Of this number, 7,472 (73 percent) were convictions and 2,692 (26 percent) were dismissed. (See Tables III-9, III-10, and III-11). Of the 7,472 convictions in the courts, 6,811 (91 percent) were from guilty pleas. Of the 733 jury trials held, 645 (88 percent) convictions were obtained. At the end of 1972 the case backlog had increased by 1,521 cases, potentially compounding the average 271-day waiting time for a trial. With the creation of the Impact courts, however, the length of time to trial is projected to be reduced to 90 days.

Two key problem areas in the courts as identified by a 1971 grand jury are: (1) No quick and routine way to dispose of repeat offenders (additional cases before trial) and (2) concurrent sentencing is the rule in Dallas courts, thus creating a “free crime” atmosphere.

e. JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

The Justice of the Peace Court is generally called the “People’s Court”. Dallas County has eight Justice Precincts and ten Justices of the Peace. The two city precincts — one on either side of the Trinity River — in the Dallas County Courthouse and in the Oak Cliff Sub-Courthouse — each have two Justices. There is also a Justice of the Peace in each of the other six Sub-Courthouses located in Richardson, Garland, Mesquite, Lancaster, Grand Prairie and Irving.

In these ten courts are tried the smaller law suits of the County; civil cases where the amount in controversy is under $200; and criminal cases where the range of punishment is limited to fines not exceeding $200. A Justice of the Peace cannot sentence a defendant to jail, although a defendant may serve out a fine in jail.

The Justice of the Peace has many duties. He must hold Examining Trials on felony charges, set bail, and inspect and forward felony charges to the Grand Jury for action. He also issues Search Warrants to Peace Officers, handles all Eviction Suits in his precinct, and presides over Peace Bond proceedings.

Each Justice is elected from his own precinct. The Justice of the Peace precinct boundaries are set by Commissioners Court and are the same as the Constable precinct boundaries. The estimated budget for these courts in 1973 is $523,228.

f. JUVENILE COURTS

Juvenile Court has jurisdiction concurrent with the district courts, juvenile courts, and courts of domestic relations situated in Dallas County of all cases involving adoptions, removal of disability of minority and coverture, wife and child desertion, delinquent, neglected or dependent child proceedings, Reciprocal Support Act, and all jurisdiction, powers, and authority now or hereafter placed in the district or county courts under the juvenile and child welfare laws of the state; and of all divorce and marriage annulment cases, including the adjustment of property rights and custody and support of minor children.
### TABLE III-9
Combined Report of All Criminal and Judicial District Courts
Summary of Year 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convictions</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquittals</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung Juries</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanity Hearings</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrials</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contested Trial Before the Court</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jury Trials ᵃ</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pleas of Guilty Before Court</td>
<td>6,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pleas of Not Guilty Before Court</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convictions</td>
<td>7,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases Dismissed</td>
<td>2,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases Quashed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Disposed Cases</td>
<td>10,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cases Filed</td>
<td>11,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Received from Other Courts</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Transferred to Other Courts</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of New Cases</td>
<td>11,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocations of Probated Sentences</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocations of Suspended Sentences</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revocations of Sentences</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog Increased by</td>
<td>1,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The above figures do not include sanity hearings.*
TABLE III-10
Statistics on Felony Cases
Dallas County 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Filed by D. A. (Number of Cases)</th>
<th>Felonies</th>
<th>Murder*</th>
<th>Rape*</th>
<th>Robbery*</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft** Over $50</th>
<th>Felony Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Bills (Estimated)</td>
<td>15,638</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indictments Returned (True Bills)</td>
<td>3,946</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>11,692</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Guilty to Offense Charged</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Guilty Plea</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>(est)</td>
<td>(est)</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Court or Jury</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Guilty to Lesser Offense |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Note: Reductions are not listed by original offense in the court reports.) | | | | | | | |
| By Guilty Plea | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| By Court or Jury | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Acquitted | 36 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 7 |
| Dismissed (Estimated) | 2,692 | 127 | 27 | 54 | 269 | 234 | 269 | N/A |
| Referred to Juvenile Authorities*** | 3,346 | 14 | 35 | 124 | 1,191 | 262 | 598 | N/A |
| Cases Pending 1/1/72 | 9,067 | N/A | N/A | 124 | 1,191 | 262 | 598 | N/A |
| Cases Pending 12/31/72 (Estimated) | 10,883 | 544 | 326 | 827 | 1,012 | 1,437 | 3,004 | 1,832 |

(Note: Offense figures are based on sample taken from list of apprehended cases.)

*Includes assault to murder, assault to rape, and assault to rob.

**Includes auto theft, except for one category as listed below.

***476 auto thefts in this category.

N/A — Not Available
### TABLE III-11

**Jury Trials in 1972**

**All Felony Courts Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Number Tried</th>
<th>Number of Convictions</th>
<th>Number of Acquittals</th>
<th>Number of Mistrials</th>
<th>Number of Death Sent.</th>
<th>Number of Life Sent.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics Other Than Marijuana</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana, Sale</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana, Possession</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Life sentences include terms of years from 99 up

### Pleas of Guilty Before the Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Number Pled</th>
<th>Number Life Sentences*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics Other Than Marijuana</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana, Sale</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana, Possession</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Life sentences include terms of years from 99 up
involved therein, alimony pending final hearing, and any other matter incident to divorce or annulment proceedings as well as independent actions involving child custody or support of minors, change of name of persons; and all other cases involving justifiable controversies and differences between spouses, or between parents, or between them or one of them, and their minor children, or between any of these and third persons, corporations, trustee, or other legal entities, which are now, or may hereafter be, within the jurisdiction of the district or county courts; all cases in which children are alleged or charged to be dependent and neglected children or delinquent children as provided by law, of all suits for trial of title to land and for the enforcement of liens thereon, of all suits for trial of the right of property, and the court shall have power to issue writs “of habeas corpus, mandamus, injunction, and all writs necessary to enforce their jurisdiction.” During 1972 the two juvenile courts handled a total of 1,399 juvenile cases. Of these cases, 753 (54 percent) were placed on or continued on juvenile probation and 205 (15 percent) were committed to the Texas Youth Council. Prosecution of juvenile cases is handled through a special section of the District Attorney’s Office.

g. MENTAL ILLNESS COURT
The Mental Illness Court is responsible for processing, through court, all involuntary commitments to a private or state mental hospital. Assistants in the court provide information to the general public.

h. PROBATE COURTS
Duties and responsibilities of a Judge of a Probate Court include applications and trials for the probate of wills, the granting of administration in Decedents estates and in various types of guardianship estates. Approximately 1750 or 1800 new proceedings are filed in each of the two Probate Courts annually, with several thousand estates pending annually. The number of cases increases each year due to the growing number of cases filed and consistently a lesser number are disposed of due to the fact that most proceedings remain pending for more than a year’s duration, and in guardianship estates most of them continue over a lengthy period of years.

Except in “independent administrations” all of the administrative affairs in the various types of estates are conducted under the supervision and orders of the Court, which entails hearing and considering thousands of applications each year. Additionally, accountings are required annually in these proceedings with the responsibility of seeing that the accountings are filed and are brought into such condition as the Court may act upon them in order to see that the estates are being properly administered and to take remedial measures when they are not.

i. CITY MUNICIPAL COURTS
For violations of municipal ordinances, six municipal courts have been established. During 1972, 38,506 jail cases were set for trial. Prosecution in these cases is handled by the City Attorney’s Office. The cost of operating the six municipal courts was $1.2 million, while $4.3 million was collected in fines for violations against the city.

j. DISTRICT CLERK
The District Clerk is the administrator and record keeper for the Civil District, Criminal District, Domestic Relations and Juvenile Courts of Dallas County. He is the custodian of all papers and instruments filed directly with the office in all lawsuits in the listed courts. The District Clerk’s office furnishes each judge of the named courts with at least one full time court deputy and in some courts two or more. The staff of the District Clerk’s Office executes, issues or files writs, warrants, citations, notices to show cause, executions, abstracts of judgments, and other papers involved in trying and disposition of many kinds of law suits.
The District Clerk has custody of a trust fund of monies involved in lawsuits over which
the judges have control by court orders. Another fund under the custody of the District
Clerk, called the Special Fund, covers court cost deposits and other monies involving
law suits.

The District Clerk's office is also charged with the duty of paying petit juries called
each week to serve in the District, County and Justice Courts of the County.

k. COUNTY CLERK

The Dallas County Clerk serves the County Courts. His functions encompass county
courts at law (civil); criminal courts; and courts of criminal appeal; probate courts; mental
illness courts; and clerk of the commissioners court.

I. DISTRICT ATTORNEY

The Dallas County District Attorney's Office is responsible for representing the state in
the prosecution of criminal cases in both the District and County Courts. The District
Attorney is the chief legal advisor for Dallas County. This office is staffed by 73 full time
prosecutors and 25 investigators (15 county and ten on assignment from the City of Dallas
Police Department.) An organizational chart of the District Attorney's Office is shown in
Figure III-3.

A brief description of the positions shown on the organizational chart of the District
Attorney's Office follows:

First Assistant District Attorney — assists the district attorney and supervises the
prosecution staff. Remuneration for the position is approximately $30,000.

Assistant District Attorneys — the three assistant district attorneys are the chief felony
prosecutors and supervise other prosecutors assigned to the Criminal District Courts.
The chief prosecutor is responsible for the disposition of all cases sent to his court.
Each chief prosecutor receives an annual salary of $23,000.

Number Two Prosecutors — all Dallas County Criminal District Courts are assigned
a number two prosecutor. Number two prosecutors usually alternate their trial work
with the chief prosecutor.

Number Three Prosecutors — a Number Three prosecutor is assigned to every Dallas
County Criminal Court. Their duties include assisting the Chief Prosecutor and Number
Two Prosecutor in case preparation and trial work. Annual salary for this position is
$14,000.

Chief Investigator and County Investigators — these individuals assist the prosecutors
in the preparation of case. The Investigators duties include gathering information on
each case by working with law enforcement agencies, interviewing witnesses and, on
request, interviewing defendants.

City Investigators — The Dallas Police Department furnishes one investigator per
Criminal District Court to assist the County investigators. These investigators are paid
by the City of Dallas an annual salary of $9,684 each, and Dallas County pays them a
monthly auto allowance of $150.

Appellate Section Chief and Appellate Attorneys — Presently one attorney from the
appeals section of the District Attorneys Office is assigned to each Criminal District
Court. The Appellate Attorney is responsible for pre-trial briefs concerning all legal
issues arising in the appellate process, for in-trial technical advice to the prosecuting
attorneys, the preparation of appellate briefs, and the representation of the State
throughout the appeal of all cases.
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FIGURE III-3
Dallas County District Attorney’s Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT ATTORNEY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF FELONY PROSECUTORS (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF PROSECUTOR OF FELONY COURT (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 PROSECUTOR OF FELONY COURT (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 PROSECUTOR OF FELONY COURT (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY INVESTIGATOR (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY INVESTIGATOR (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRIAL SECTION SECRETARIES (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPELLATE SECTION SECRETARIES (2)</td>
<td>APPELLATE SECTION ATTORNEYS (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORDS SECTION CLERKS (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND JURY SECRETARY (1)</td>
<td>GRAND JURY ATTORNEY (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND JURY REPORTER (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUSTICE OF PEACE SECTION SECRETARY (1)</td>
<td>JUSTICE OF PEACE SECTION ATTORNEY (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLAINT SECTION SECRETARY (1)</td>
<td>POLICE COMPLAINT ATTORNEY (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSECUTION TEAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIVILIAN COMPLAINT ATTORNEY (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERICAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secretarial Administrator and Records Chief — The person who occupies this position supervises the clerical personnel in the office and interviews prospective clerical employees. Duties include the supervision of personnel in the Records Division to see that all files are maintained accurately and cases dispensed properly, supervision of the systematic cataloging of cases, giving information to the public regarding pending cases, assuring the confidential nature of certain records maintained in the division, and dispensing to the trial attorneys the information sent to the District Attorney’s Office on cases filed by law enforcement agencies.

Appellate Section Secretaries — These secretaries are responsible for typing motions, letters, legal documents and appellate briefs for both the Prosecuting and Appellate Attorneys.

Records Section - Clerks — are responsible for the preparation of case jackets on all felony cases filed, filing permanent index cards on each case filed, preparing complainant cross-index files for each case, posting case number, court-number, and assigning a prosecutor to each case, distributing the cases to the prosecutors, marking disposition of case as to date of trial, method of trial, outcome of case and sentence given, separation and preparation of disposed case jackets for permanent storage, and dispensing information concerning whether cases were filed, which court the case will be tried in, and which prosecutor has been assigned to the case.

In addition to the ordinary duties now performed by the Records Division, systematic cataloging of cases involving Impact crimes (stranger-to-stranger street crimes and burglary) and repeat offenders will be performed by these Clerks and the data furnished to the computer system for automated tracking and statistical reporting.

Grand Jury Attorney — The Grand Jury Attorney is primarily responsible for presenting State's witnesses before the Grand Jury and for rendering legal advice to the Grand Jury. The annual salary for this position is $16,500.

Justice of the Peace Court Attorneys — are assigned to the Justice of the Peace Courts for the purpose of conducting examining trials on felony complaints, interviewing State's witnesses, and presenting primafacie cases of guilt of the offense charges.

Police Complaint Attorney and Civilian Complaint Attorney — handles complaints and indictments when a local police agency or citizen brings cases into the District Attorneys Office for formal filing. Cases are reviewed for adequacy and legality of evidences. Cases are screened and the case is accepted by the District Attorney.

This section often assists in the collection of worthless checks.

During 1972, the District Attorney’s Office submitted a total of 15,638 information files to the Grand Jury, 11,692 (75 percent) of which received a true bill. Of the 733 jury trials prosecuted by the District Attorney’s Office, 645 (88 percent) resulted in a conviction. The operating budget for the District Attorney’s Office in 1972 was $1,322,000.

The District Attorney’s Office has benefited from the computerized information system (developed as a pilot subject-in-process project).

There is still need for additional systems development and internal programming of records to bring the system into full automated form to respond to the influx of Impact crimes. There is a continuing need for resources to develop a system for administrative management so that a greater volume of felony cases with insured legal safeguards can be adequately prosecuted.
m. GRAND JURY

The Dallas County Grand Jury performs vitally important functions for the criminal justice system. These important factors are: (1) to identify crime problems, (2) to hear and return indictments in criminal cases. There is need to assist the Grand Jury so that more adequate investigative input is furnished thus reducing the time from arrest to indictment. The workload of the grand jury should be reduced allowing more time to adequately review the more important cases. This is presently being accomplished by use of indictment information.

n. DEFENSE FOR INDIGENTS — DALLAS COUNTY

The Dallas judiciary in April of 1972 implemented a program to more effectively respond to the needs of indigent defendants in Dallas County. This program combines the appointment of defense council with the statutorial authority providing for waiver of indictment. It is believed that this program is now effectively responding to the needs of indigent defendants in Dallas County.

Under the present system, selection of an appointed attorney is made by a Criminal Court Judge from two sources: Random Selection of attorneys from the Dallas Bar Association List or Specific Appointment of an individual attorney. A criminal court judge may elect, at his discretion, which method of appointment he chooses to utilize, or he may use both methods, depending upon the individual case.

Random Selection: The list of attorneys prepared by the Dallas Bar Association is comprised of practicing attorneys with more than three years experience in law practice and under the age of 65. Each attorney whose name appears upon the Dallas Bar Association list has been individually screened by a subcommittee of practicing attorneys prior to inclusion on the list. The same method and list of attorneys is utilized by Federal Court Judges in Dallas for appointment of counsel for indigent defendants.

Specific Appointment: Under this method, certain safeguards are provided to the accused in that the appointing judge is able to evaluate the seriousness of the charges against the defendant and related degree of difficulty in the preparation of the case; weighing these factors the judge may appoint specific lawyers who specialize in particular areas of criminal law. Frequently, different attorneys will be appointed to represent the indigent during various stages of the case; one appointed attorney may demonstrate talents in the trial portion and later be replaced by another attorney skilled in appeal preparation.

As to the quality of attorneys appointed, where the defendant not indigent, he would have the same lawyers to choose from as appear on the “Random Selection” list; except that in many instances, even a non-indigent would not have sufficient funds to hire many of the attorneys who appear on the list. The same situation would be found under the “Specific Appointment” methods. Proof of this maxim is evident when counting the low number of post-conviction Writs of Habeas Corpus granted on the basis of incompetent counsel.

In the past, assignment of court-appointed attorneys for indigent defendants, for the most part, came after indictment and assignment of the case to a Criminal District Court. Criminal District Judges are now appointing attorneys for indigent defendants immediately after confinement in the Dallas County Jail. This confinement occurs upon transfer from the City of Dallas jail or upon direct confinement by other law enforcement agencies. These procedures often enable defendants to be released from the jail within two or three days and are performed in conjunction with waiver of indictment.
C. CORRECTIONS

1. FEDERAL

The Dallas area is currently served by four major federal correctional components. The Federal Corrections Institution at Seagoville serves as a minimum security facility and has a maximum capacity of 460 inmates. The majority of offenders in this unit have been transferred from other federal correctional institutions to prepare them for reintegration into the community. This institution is currently using several new correctional treatment concepts which help keep the Seagoville unit as one of the model facilities of the nation. In addition, Dallas is the central office of Region VI of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Duties of this regional office include coordination of all federal community services in the five-state region, staffing of two community treatment centers, employment development and placement, aftercare for drug-related inmates, and inspection of jails and other facilities under Federal contract.

The third federal component in Dallas is the Dallas Community Treatment Center. This center, a halfway house, is located just blocks from the central downtown area. Employment resources, entertainment, and transportation are abundant in this location. This halfway house has a total capacity of 36 male residents, with the average population being 33. The main purpose of the facility is to provide residents, most of whom are still under sentence, with a gradual transition between incarceration and parole.

The last major component in the federal correctional system is the Federal Probation Office which operates under the federal judicial system. In this office, 14 officers handle approximately 1,000 persons in 101 counties of North and West Texas. Cases under the supervision of this office include probationers, parolees, mandatory releasees, certain releasees from military facilities, and other persons under the supervision of federal courts.

2. STATE

Convicted felons from Dallas County are found in all 14 units of the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC), which is centered in Huntsville. Programs within TDC range from the agricultural endeavors of the farm units to heavy industry and construction, making TDC almost a completely self-supporting system.

On February 1, 1973, 2,752 inmates (17.3 percent) of the total TDC population were on sentence from Dallas County. The average age of these Dallas County offenders was 31 years. 58.2 percent were black, 37.1 percent were white, and the remaining 4.6 percent were Mexican-American. (See Table III-12). Females comprised only 4.4 percent of the Dallas County inmates, and the average educational achievement level for the entire Dallas population was 6.8 years. It is also significant that 46.9 percent of the Dallas population had at least one prior state probated sentence, with 37.9 percent having one or more prior TDC confinement. (See Table III-13.) An analysis of offenses by race indicated that both whites and blacks had been found guilty of burglary and robbery, while Mexican-Americans were primarily committed to TDC for burglary and drug offenses. (See Table III-14).

Data are also available on those persons released to Dallas from TDC during the 12-month period ending February 1, 1973. During this time, a total of 1,383 inmates were released through either discharge (serve-all sentence) or parole. (See Table III-15). A total of 682 (49.3 percent) inmates were discharged, while 701 (50.7 percent) were paroled. The number of persons paroled increased from the 15.3 percent figure paroled last year. A comparison of the dischargee and the parolee indicated that the average age of both groups is 31 years; parolees had a slightly higher level of educational attainment. 38.6 percent of the parolees were married, while only 27.8 percent of dischargees were married. The most apparent difference between the dischargee and the parolee is in the area of prior confinements. Dischargees categorically had higher prior records of probated sentences, detention home confinements, jail sentences, TDC confinements, and out of state prison confinements (See Table III-16).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th></th>
<th>WHITE AND OTHERS</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEXICAN-AMERICAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No. of Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>44.95%</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>46.72%</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>40.90%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>14.72%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10.37%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.87%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.47%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.80%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.44%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III-13
Dallas County Inmates in TDC
February 1, 1973
Prior Confinements by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Confinement</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>WHITE AND OTHERS</th>
<th>MEXICAN-AMERICAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Home</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>58.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail (Sentences)</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>36.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatory</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>74.60%</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>75.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Prison</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>24.89%</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>26.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>37.86%</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>36.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Prison</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>14.86%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Total No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>Black No. of Inmates</td>
<td>Black Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>58.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>29.72%</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>31.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.91%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>28.31%</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Over $50</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>18.79%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>17.30%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with Intent</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>14.39%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>10.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III-15
All Inmates Released to Dallas
1970-1971-1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total Released</th>
<th></th>
<th>Discharged</th>
<th></th>
<th>Paroled</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>51.19%</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>39.17%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>34.29%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>77.34%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>22.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>51.23%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>44.53%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>43.30%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>84.71%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>49.96%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>27.84%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>22.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>45.34%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>18.94%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>26.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>49.31%</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>50.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III-16

Dallas County

Dischargees and Parolees vs.

Prior Confinement Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Confinement</th>
<th>1971 Dischargees</th>
<th>1971 Parolees</th>
<th>1972 Dischargees</th>
<th>1972 Parolees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Home</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>31.23%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail (Sentence)</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>75.37%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatory</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Prison</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.46%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>37.95%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Prison</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>682</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>33.29%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>67.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>25.66%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>36.81%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>21.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parolees planning to reside in Dallas report to the Dallas District Office of the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles. At the end of 1972, 1,233 parolees were under the supervision of 15 parole officers, making the average caseload per officer 82. A sampling of the previous 12-months' records found that almost 70 percent of all revocations were for burglary, robbery, and theft over $50.

The Texas Youth Council (TYC), centered in Gatesville, is charged with care, treatment, education, and training of delinquent youth and with the supervision and care of dependent and neglected children. Residential, institutional, and after-care programs are all included in the responsibility of the Youth Council. Facilities are located statewide, with each facility handling specific types of children. In addition, numerous residential placement centers exist in communities on a contractual basis. 1971 Youth Council figures indicate that 18.9 percent of all children admitted into TYC were from Dallas County. Using 1972 Dallas County Juvenile Court figures, 96 of the 204 commitments to TYC were for Index crimes; and auto theft accounted for most of these offenses.

3. LOCAL

Dallas County corrections-related programs are composed of the Dallas County jail, Pre-Trial Release Program, Adult Probation Department, the Dallas City Jail, and juvenile programs. Three separate facilities comprise the Dallas County jail system; one facility was constructed in 1915, another in 1950, and the latest in 1968. The total capacity for these three facilities is approximately 1,555. "Capacity," however, takes into account segregation of prisoners, i.e., separation of pre-trial detainees, appeal cases and persons serving misdemeanor sentences; separate facilities for male and female; separation of adult offenders and juvenile offenders; etc. The practical capacity of the jail is reduced by the necessity to provide separate facilities for the various categories of offenders. In addition to county and state offenders, the Dallas County jail is also used as a detaining facility by federal criminal justice agencies (law enforcement, immigration, courts, etc.). (See Table III-17.)

In Dallas, as in other Texas counties, the Sheriff is the official keeper of the jail. The actual operation of the jail, however, falls under the direction of the chief jailer, and the custodial staff is drawn from the enforcement ranks. Correctional programs within the jail include non-credit college courses, a G.E.D. program, and a library project which is jointly operated by the jail and the Community Education Division of the Dallas Public Library. (See Figure III-4.)

In addition to the county jail system, the City of Dallas operates a single jail facility. This jail, however, is used only as a short-term lockup facility and for short-term municipal ordinance violators (primarily public inebriates). During the 1972-73 budget period, it was estimated that 71,400 prisoners would be detained, with the daily count averaging 248. Staffing within the jail is composed primarily of 75 Public Service Officers (non-authorized uniformed officers) who serve as correctional officers and 33 other personnel which compose the administrative, support, and clerical sections. The operating budget for the 1972-73 budget period was $978,124, 90% of which was allocated for personnel services.

In an attempt to help alleviate the overcrowding of the jails, the Pre-Trial Release program was established. Under this program, certain categories of offenders awaiting trial are eligible for release on personal bond (i.e., release on recognizance). During 1972, 24,580 persons were considered for release under this program; of these 3,351 (13.6 percent) were released on personal bond. During this same period, there were 334 forfeitures for non-appearance, commission of new offenses, etc.; 172 were set aside by the court, resulting in a total of 162 bond forfeitures during the year. According to estimates of the Pre-Trial Release office, program participants spent 1,187,550 man days on release that might otherwise have been spent in the jail. Based on jail costs of $7.50 per day, the program is estimated to save the county approximately $8.9 million. In addition, earnings of program participants while on release were estimated in excess of 1.2
TABLE III-17
Prisoners Handled for 24 Hours
Ending Midnight March 31, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Midnight</th>
<th>In This Day</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Out This Day</th>
<th>Midnight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>W/M</th>
<th>N/M</th>
<th>W/F</th>
<th>N/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W/M</th>
<th>N/M</th>
<th>W/F</th>
<th>N/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sober-Up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Cases</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready for TDC</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent This Month</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent This Year</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total man days in jail this year</td>
<td>101,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total prisoners at peak today</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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million per month. Consideration should also be given to the savings of the county and state welfare departments, the tax contributions of program participants to the community, the savings of legal aid costs, and the additional expenses that might have been incurred providing facilities for these additional prisoners in the jails. The 1972 operating budget for this program was $99,839. (See Figure III-5.)

The fourth Dallas County corrections program is under the direction of the Dallas County Adult Probation Department. At the end of 1972, 24 probation officers supervised 6,800 felony probationers. Each adult probation officer had an average caseload of 290. A recent Impact grant award, however, is reducing caseloads and anticipated makeup of the Probation Department is depicted in Figure III-6. Currently, all prospective probationers are screened through a pre-sentence investigation. This pre-sentence investigation includes a check on family ties, employment status, social contacts, and prior criminal history. In addition, all Impact offenders requesting probation are given thorough psychological examinations, by the staff psychologist. As noted in the following organizational chart, specialists work with all offenders referred to them by the supervisory staff. Table III-18 also depicts information on Index offenders under the supervision of the department.

Responsibility for the treatment of delinquents and the care of dependent and neglected children in Dallas falls under the direction of the Dallas County Juvenile Department. Programs and facilities of the department include the Administration and Court Services Section, the Detention Home, the Sunshine Home, Child Support Division, Girls' Day Care Center, the Boys' Home, and Child Welfare Unit. (See Figure III-7). In addition, the Rotary Club of Dallas received a grant from the Texas Criminal Justice Council for the establishment of the “Rotary Town House,” a halfway house for boys released from the Boys’ Home at Hutchins. Also, the department has been awarded an Impact grant which forms a “Court Action Processing Unit” to handle court-related matters; thus allowing more time for field and office supervisory duties for the probation officers.

During 1972 a total of 8,433 referrals were made to the department and 8,318 cases received dispositions. Caseloads for juvenile workers averaged 75 (64 supervisory and 11 investigative). Referrals for males outnumbered those for females by almost three to one, with 16-year olds leading the list of referrals by age. While the number of black and white males referred was almost equal, white female referrals were three times that of black females. In terms of delinquency referrals by offense, burglary accounted for approximately 36 percent of all dispositions, with drugs accounting for 17 percent. Of the 8,318 dispositions made during the year, 2,953 (36 percent) were placed on or continued on probation, 1,943 (23 percent) counseled and/or warned, and the remaining 41 percent handled through various state and local juvenile programs. (See Figure III-8.)

Another major component in the juvenile system of Dallas is the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). While the DISD itself is not a part of the juvenile justice system, it has taken the viewpoint that the school is usually the first place that delinquency can be detected and thus can be instrumental in helping to alleviate conditions conducive to this problem. In an attempt to work with students, the DISD joined together with the Dallas Police Department’s Youth Division and the Dallas County Juvenile Department to form eleven School-Community Guidance Centers. In each center, a DISD teacher, a secretary, two advisors (counselors), a uniformed police officer, and a juvenile probation officer work as a team to identify, diagnose, counsel with, and do follow-up work on students with behavior problems. Also, eleven Youth Action Centers, each having an advisor (counselor), a uniformed police officer, and a secretary, function in much the same manner to work with students in problem situations.

In addition, Metropolitan Learning Centers have been established by the DISD to carry education to dropouts and students who prefer to attend school outside the established framework. In each of these centers, students progress at their own rates, thus avoiding the frustration often felt in the standard classroom situation by many problem students.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Murder*</th>
<th>Rape*</th>
<th>Robbery*</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>T/Oe.</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>Felony Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total on Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/72</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Probation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No Previous Probation</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 99%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Revoked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total — 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Probation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No Previous Probation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 99%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Completions</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total for Year 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Probation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No Previous Probation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
<td>(Est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 99%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes assault to murder, assault to rape, and assault to rob.
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4. CORRECTIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which presented its recommendations to the National Conference of Criminal Justice in January of this year, offered the following observations in regard to our present correctional philosophy and practice:

- There is convincing evidence that current use of and practices in traditional penal institutions intensify and compound the problems they profess to correct.
- The cost of institutionalization, particularly with the system’s current excessive emphasis on security and hardware, is reaching a magnitude beyond all reason.
- The majority of offenders currently are treated as violent and dangerous despite the fact that only a few of them conform to this unfortunate stereotype.
- Time spent in confinement is inversely related to success on parole, and community-based programs appear to be more effective than traditional institutional programs in providing community protection.
- Imprisonment has negative effects on an offender’s ability to develop sufficient skills and competence to perform culturally prescribed roles after release into the community.

A community-based corrections program is oriented toward the use of community resources in an attempt to reintegrate offenders back into the community from which they came. In some cases, physical facilities need to be constructed; in others this need does not exist. Community/regional corrections draws heavily on the concept that existing vocational, educational, medical, psychological, and other facilities and services needed in a rehabilitation program are in existence and that offenders can simultaneously draw from these community resources while remaining within the correctional system.

Correctional statistics indicate that a large majority of all offenders will return to the community from which they were sent to prison. The philosophy of reintegration emphasizes that offenders be prepared to return to communities with different characteristics, life styles and employment opportunities. The urban Dallas offender has problems and needs different from rural offenders. With different communities producing offenders with different problems, it becomes evident that offenders experience varied needs in being reintegrated within the community. At this point, the centralized, state-based correctional system loses its value. It is questionable whether an agrarian oriented, state correctional system can meet the total needs of the urban Dallas offender.

Mutual benefits to the community and offender are gained in the development of a community-based corrections program:

- Offenders are kept in or near the environment to which they will return upon discharge from sentence. Work and educational release programs become possible within the metropolitan job market and educational institutions. Also, funds spent on correctional programs remain within the community. (Example: work release earnings, staff salaries expended in the community, etc.)
- A major factor in community corrections is that community ties can be maintained and possibly strengthened by the offender and the community through work with the family. Under the current system, it is hard to expect a man to maintain close family relationships when a multi-hour drive by the family is required for a 30-minute visit.
- One of the most important elements of community corrections, however, is the element of local input into correctional programs for local offenders. It is obvious that local criminal justice leaders have little or no input into the present state-operated correctional system. Under the establishment of community/regional correctional centers, however, local needs can be met through the imposition of local programs and controls.
Community corrections allows the correctional system to become an integrated part of the local criminal justice system. Corrections will no longer be an "out of sight, out of mind" situation but instead a visible, functioning criminal justice unit which will be responsible for results to the local community.

In summary, community corrections is a concept based upon the premise that a centralized, state, maximum security penal system does not fully meet the needs of the offender or the community to which over 98 percent of all offenders will return. Local communities can best meet the needs of the majority of their offenders and can do so with existing community resources by preparing the offender for reintegration into the community. Local communities can have greater, more effective control over the correctional programs for offenders while at the same time making the correctional system an integral and functional member of the community criminal justice system.

In surveying the Dallas correctional system, few if any community outreach resources exist outside the Dallas County Adult and Juvenile Probation Departments. Halfway house facilities which are so adequately used in the federal correctional system are altogether lacking in both state and local corrections. In addition, there appears to be a complete lack of any services for discharges returning from TDC.

As one would expect, discharges (serve-all sentences) are those inmates with the least promising background. They have higher rates of prior incarceration, fewer family and community ties, and return to no form of help, supervision, or surveillance upon arrival in Dallas. With no community help, $50, and a bus ticket to Dallas, discharges have shown a strong tendency to return to crime.

As described earlier, several correctional programs now exist within the county jail. Due to limited space and personnel, however, these programs are somewhat limited in terms of their potential outreach. There is thus a need for all ongoing programs to be continued and expanded where possible and for new programs to be developed so that all eligible jail inmates may have adequate access to rehabilitation services.

Another area of noticeable deficiency in the Dallas correctional system is that of alcohol and drug treatment programs for offenders. According to estimates made by both Dallas Police Department officials and drug treatment staff members, there are approximately 1,000 narcotic addicts arrested annually for criminal offenses. Offenses centering on monetary gain such as burglary, theft, and robbery are believed to be committed by addicts attempting to obtain money for their drug habits. Although there is a small drug treatment program in existence, no comprehensive facilities or programs exist for the addict with criminal charges.

In a similar manner, professional services are found to be altogether lacking in the treatment of the alcohol-related offender. A major deficiency noted in Dallas is the lack of programs for the public inebriate. During 1972, there were 18,411 arrests for drunkenness in the City of Dallas. In addition, 4,535 arrests were made for disorderly conduct, the majority of which were alcohol-related. According to information provided by a recent 12-month printout of all persons arrested for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, 187 men accounted for more than 3,762 arrests within that year. Coupling this information with the fact that each drunkenness arrest takes approximately 40 minutes of the officer's time from initial contact to the return to the beat, well over 12,000 man-hours were spent in the previous year arresting drunk persons. These arrests cost the city approximately $228,000, in addition to the detention cost in the jail ($36.19 per visit). These two factors highlight the need for comprehensive treatment services for drug- and alcohol-related offenders.

Last, statistics presented in this plan indicate an overburdened juvenile justice system handling heavy caseloads of juveniles. The severity of the juvenile problem in Dallas is described in statistics which indicate that almost one-half of all serious crimes, including Impact crimes,
are committed by juveniles. Truants and school dropouts who no longer function within the social environment of the educational system tend to be disproportionately delinquent. In the handling of potential delinquents diversionary resources are limited, indicating a lack of sufficient alternatives to juvenile detention; and a foster home and other community-based shelter facilities are needed.

D. INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The availability of timely and accurate information has long been recognized as a requisite for conducting effective criminal justice programs. Information generated by the activities of law enforcement organizations and the movement of criminal elements must be collected, analyzed and stored for later use and exchange, both within and among these agencies. Information exchanges among law enforcement agencies have become more critical in recent years because of the increasing mobility of this nation's population, including its criminal element. The Texas Criminal Justice Council's 1971 Criminal Justice Plan for Texas states:

The goal of improving communications and information systems in the nation and in Texas criminal justice activities remains one of the highest priorities of national, state and local agencies within the criminal justice system.

Continual demands upon criminal justice agencies have necessitated the search for new technology to meet the increasing demands for rapid accessibility and availability of information on local, regional, state and national levels. Criminal justice agencies' functions have become more complex and dynamic, and require improvements not only in the criminal justice process, but also in management, planning, and control, for more effective operations. It is apparent that emphasis must be placed on developing a totally integrated information system, well grounded in communications, that will bring about the unity and integrity required for the criminal justice process. It must satisfy current and projected needs of law enforcement, prosecution, defense, courts, probation, correction, pardons and paroles, and other state and local agencies having need for criminal justice information.

Interagency communications have been improved through the efforts of the state and federal governments, as may be demonstrated in the cases of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), the Texas Crime Information Center (TCIC), the Law Enforcement Teletype System (LETS), and the Texas Law Enforcement Teletype Network (TLETN). These communications networks enable subscribing agencies to obtain certain types of information from a multitude of other police agencies, usually within a shorter time and at lower cost than was the case before their inception.

This discussion of information systems is divided into sections for national, state and local systems and provides an overview of criminal justice information systems currently in operation and available to criminal justice agencies in the Dallas area.

1. NATIONAL SYSTEM — THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER (NCIC)

The National Crime Information Center is a nationwide computerized information network under the management control of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The system objective is to improve the effectiveness of law enforcement through the more efficient handling and exchange of documented police information. The system is basically a computerized index to documented police information concerning crime and criminals of nationwide interest.

The network basically consists of a central computer in Washington, D.C., and numerous low speed terminal locations, including at least one terminal in each of the 50 states and one in Canada. Users may enter and access information concerning:

(1) stolen, missing or recovered guns

(2) stolen articles
(3) wanted or missing persons
(4) stolen/wanted vehicles
(5) stolen license plates
(6) stolen, embezzled or missing securities

2. STATE SYSTEMS

The telecommunications system serving the Texas criminal justice community consists of the following elements: the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), the Texas Crime Information Center (TCIC), Law Enforcement Teletype Service (LETS), Texas Law Enforcement Teletype Network (TLETN), and several dedicated data access circuits between Austin and other major Texas cities.

a. TEXAS CRIME INFORMATION CENTER (TCIC)

TCIC is a service agency of the Texas Department of Public Safety and a major tool for furnishing information to law enforcement agencies in the State of Texas. The major objective of the system is to efficiently store all pertinent records of stolen items and wanted/missing persons for rapid retrieval and reference. The TCIC can be pictured as being comprised of three major components: the user, the communications network, and the record storage and retrieval system. Figure III-9 gives a graphic description of the overall system configuration. The user will have access to both TCIC and NCIC data bases from a single terminal. A certain amount of edit and format-checking of all messages will be done by the communications processor which will enable the detection and rejection of improper messages at an early time. The design of the TCIC system corresponds with that of the NCIC system; therefore, the user need be concerned only with one set of operating procedures.

b. LAW ENFORCEMENT TELETYPE SERVICE (LETS)

Law Enforcement Teletype Service is a teletype network that covers the 48 contiguous states. It was established to permit the exchange of law enforcement information between these states. Basic system elements consist of a message switching center (TELESWITCHER) located in Phoenix, Arizona, with eight 75 baud teletype loops connecting the states to the switcher. The single terminal in Texas is located at the Department of Public Safety in Austin. Texas is on a loop circuit with the states of Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma. The volume of traffic which this system must accommodate can easily saturate the system. Therefore, the policy has been established that each state would be authorized to interface at only one point. In Texas that point is the Department of Public Safety in Austin.

c. TEXAS LAW ENFORCEMENT TELETYPE NETWORK (TLETN)

The TLETN is basically a 75 baud teletype network serving the various law enforcement agencies record communications needs throughout the state. TLETN enables each terminal to communicate with any other terminal in the state and with the state communications control center at the Department of Public Safety in Austin. Each terminal is afforded access to the LETS system through the Department of Public Safety in Austin.

The network is made up of a store-and-forward message switch located at the Department of Public Safety in Austin serving approximately 300 teletype terminals located at various law enforcement agencies and offices throughout the state and message switchers in Houston and Dallas to serve users in those areas. A switcher has also been recently installed in the Dallas area serving approximately 35 teletype users and two computers in the North Central Texas Region.
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FIGURE III-9
Stolen and Wanted System

Source: Texas Department of Public Safety
Texas Crime Information Center Operating Manual
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d. OTHER COMMUNICATIONS CIRCUITS

Other communications circuits supporting law enforcement include:

- Dedicated circuits from NCIC to Austin, Dallas and Houston.
- Dial-up teletype service with the Highway Department in Austin from police departments in San Antonio and Austin.
- Dial-up teletype service from the Highway Department in Austin to F.B.I. offices in Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and El Paso.
- Dedicated teletype circuit between the Department of Public Safety in Austin and the LETS.
- A low speed circuit between the Highway Department and the Department of Public Safety in Austin.
- NCTCIC Circuit to Austin from City of Dallas.

Generally, the terminals are connected to the D.P.S. message switcher through loop circuits.

e. OTHER DATA FILES

The major categories of information maintained by the state correctional and law enforcement agencies are shown in Figure III-10. As these files are automated they will be made available to criminal justice agencies throughout the state. Figure III-10 also shows the relationship between state agencies in using, inputting, retrieving and processing these data files. Agency responsibility for the data files is as follows:

SOURCE: Master Plan — Texas Criminal Justice Information System

- Department of Public Safety (DPS): TCIC (Texas Crime Information Center) — Wanted persons, stolen vehicles, stolen property, criminal histories, drivers license number and modus operandi.
- Texas Highway Department (THD): Motor vehicle registration and license plate number.
- Texas Department of Corrections (TDC): Inmate records.
- Texas Youth Council (TYC): Juvenile histories.
- Board of Pardons and Paroles (BPP): Parole records.

In addition to the TCIC, described earlier, data files now accessible on-line to all terminals are the Motor Vehicle Registration files located at the Highway Department and the DPS Drivers License files. Other files will be added at later dates.

The Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) is responsible for administering the motor vehicle laws regulating registration, certificates of title, dealer’s license, vehicle salvage and wrecking yards and the allocation and distribution of license plates. The division also collects the state’s revenue from vehicle registrations and provides a central record of vehicle ownership through certificate of title procedures.

The registration and title system in Texas has been automated since 1970 and vehicle records stored in the computer are retrieved in seconds by state police, county tax collectors, and others through electronic remote inquiry devices.

The drivers license file is the responsibility of the DPS Driver and Vehicle Records Division. This computerized file contains some seven million records. The Data Processing Division provides computer support for drivers license records management. This file was placed on-line to law enforcement elements in the first quarter of 1972.
FIGURE III-10
State Data Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA FILES</th>
<th>Law Enforcement Elements</th>
<th>MCIC (FBI)</th>
<th>DPS</th>
<th>THD</th>
<th>TDC</th>
<th>TJC</th>
<th>BPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Persons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Vehicles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile History</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Records</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Plate Number</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers License Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Records</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Master Plan--Texas Criminal Justice Information System
3. LOCAL SYSTEMS

The City of Dallas and Dallas County computer facilities serve criminal justice agencies in Dallas County and the North Central Texas Region. In recent years these agencies have responded to the growing needs of the criminal justice system for more accurate and timely information through continuous systems expansions and enhancements.

The increased mobility of criminals and the increased seriousness of the crime problem has created the need for a more coordinated information-sharing capability among criminal justice agencies. The City and County are actively involved with other agencies in the state in meeting the state's high priority goals of improving communications and information systems.

For instance, as a result of the combined efforts of the Texas Criminal Justice Council, the City of Dallas, Dallas County, other member agencies of the North Central Texas Region and other regions in the state, agreements have been made for the cooperative purchase of high-speed communications video terminals which will replace many of the present ASR-28 teletype terminals in the state. This should result in increased transmission speeds through the region and into state and national files.

The following sections describe the information systems in the Dallas area. Table III-19 is an overview illustration of automated criminal justice information availability in the Dallas area. Dallas County maintains the Regional Criminal Justice System and the City of Dallas maintains the Police Information System. As shown on Figure III-11 both the city and county may communicate with state and national systems.

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION

Activities of the Dallas County Information Services Department are coordinated with other County government functions by the County Auditor, Mr. George Smith. The day-to-day management of the department is under the direction of Mr. Bobby Moore.

The Dallas County Information Services Department presently utilizes two System/370 Model 145 computers of 512k each. They are mirror image machines, each acting as a backup to the other and they have shared files with 32 spindles of 3330 disk storage with 3.2 billion characters of on-line storage. The system also uses nine 3420 Magnetic Tape Units, two of which are high speed, and 127 devices in the 3270 series of terminals.

The Dallas County system has recently been enhanced by the installation of Amigos-Hyper Faster II, a new access method and teleprocessing monitor software system.

In 1971, Dallas County began development of the Regional Criminal Justice Information System, aimed at satisfying the information needs of law enforcement agencies and the judiciary through a series of interrelated subsystems capable of application on a regional level.

So that the most critical information needs could be met without waiting for development of a total regional system and to ensure a high degree of adaptability to changes in agency requirements, subsystems were designed so that any or all of them might be put to use by participating agencies.

Subsystems that comprise this information system are as follows:

a. ADULT PROBATION SYSTEM

The Adult Probation System provides up-to-date probation data to probation officers and names of area probationers to law enforcement agencies throughout the 16-county North Central Texas region. Additionally, the system provides a complete real-time monetary accounting capability. These enable both the probation officers and the Courts to obtain fully current information regarding the probationer and his probation fee and restitution accounts.
### TABLE III-19
Overview of Computerized Criminal Justice Information in the Dallas Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Item</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Call File</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Base</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>OSR, SSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Arrest/SSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Arrest/SSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Arrest/SSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Arrest/SSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Response Time</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Call File</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Rate</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On View</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Dallas Police Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction Rate by Type Crime</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Lapse Between Arrest and:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Court Appearance</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indictment</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III-19  
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Item</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In/Jail</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In/Jail</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filings</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Population</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Trial</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Book-In</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Trial Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Referrals</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Probation Master</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Probation Master</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients Served</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Probation Master</td>
<td>On-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Statistics</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Population</td>
<td>Texas Dept. of Corr.</td>
<td>Inmate File</td>
<td>Tape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas County Information Services Department  
Dallas Police Data Processing Section
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b. BONDS AND BONDSMEN

This subsystem deals with bonds both individually and as to their effect on each bondsman’s eligibility for future bailbonds. To this end, each bond is filed in a logically distinct area of the Cases in Progress file, while a separate file of bondsmen is also maintained.

As the bonds records are co-filed with case records, all cross references, inquiries, etc., are provided in a completely analogous manner.

As the bond records are filed, updated, or deleted, appropriate postings to the bondsman’s file are made to show the number and dollar amount of bonds in each status attributed to the responsible bondsman.

These files are maintained in real-time and can assist in determining a bondsman’s status at any hour of the day.

c. BOOK-IN AND CUSTODY

The Book-In and Custody subsystem provides information and services relating to the incarceration of prisoners. The subsystem consists of a hard copy file containing as a minimum all data legally required to show justification for holding the prisoner, or pointers to such documents, including the signatures of the arresting and receiving officers and the right index fingerprint of the prisoner.

The following files are computer-maintained on an on-line real-time basis. The fundamental file is organized by a computer-assigned book-in number. For each prisoner in jail during the current month, this file contains a packet of information including:

- Data legally required to identify the prisoner, i.e., name, sex, race, date of birth, identifying numbers, right index fingerprint class, etc.
- Data required for custodial purposes, i.e., location, behavioral or health problems and next schedule court appearance.
- Data required for billing other agencies for whom prisoners are being held.
- Data which, when accumulated, will allow more efficient jail management.
- Data which, either as a legal requirement or as a voluntary service, may be provided other agencies (District Attorney, Courts, etc.) to assist them in the performance of their duties.

Another file contains a list of cells with names and pertinent data on prisoners located in those cells. Inquiry capability into this file provides automatic search to assist in determining the best available locations for new prisoners.

d. CRIMINAL CASES IN PROGRESS

The Judicial Information subsystem provides the District Criminal Courts, the District Attorney, and the District Clerk with a number of services based on past histories of, and events scheduled for, cases filed in the District Courts.

The status of each case is analyzed nightly in accordance with a scheme of statuses designed to assist participating judges in court management. Daily and weekly summary reports are prepared for each court showing counts of cases, persons, motions, writs, monies, etc., in the various categories. Status records so generated are included in the case packets for on-line inquiry.

The case history file is also fully cross-indexed by defendant name, location, and descriptors; prosecutors and defense attorneys; bail bondsmen; status, related cases.
Data contained in the case packets includes events scheduled for future dates. A file ordered by court, by associated name (judge, prosecutor, defense attorney, etc.) and by date will be provided in the near future to be used as an aid in calendaring.

Reports prepared include statistical analyses by type of offense, analyses of prosecutor performance, planned court assignment and disposition lists, and listing of name indices for public references.

e. CRIMINAL IDENTIFICATION

A subsystem currently operational on a regional basis is the Criminal Name Index. This Index provides on-line maintenance and inquiry of a computer file containing various personal identifiers and pointers to corresponding criminal record jackets maintained in the hard-copy files of participating law enforcement agencies.

f. CRIMINAL WARRANTS

The Criminal Warrants subsystem is real-time and uses three files. The first contains squads available for assignment to serve warrants and the names and badge numbers of the assigned officers. The second is the master file of outstanding warrants. The information on each such warrant includes relevant data pertaining to current and previous squad assignments. The third is a name cross-reference file.

g. DRY WRITS

The majority of these are Habeas Corpus Writs used typically to appeal after the normal time span has passed or after the normal appeal process has been exhausted.

These writs are kept in a logically distinct area of the Criminal Cases file. All data is entered and maintained by the court in which the writ was filed and covers the time span from filing until all activity on the writ has been completed.

Data on writs is shown in various reports generated in the Criminal Cases in Progress subsystem, and analogous cross references and inquiries are provided.

h. MESSAGE SWITCHING

The North Central Texas Regional Message Switching System is an advanced communications control device that controls the transmission and reception of law enforcement traffic on a leased line, private network. (See Figure III-11). In addition to its primary duty as a communications controller, it insures that all switched traffic is valid in format, and that all major components of the system (the circuit and terminals) are functioning properly.

If desired, messages are automatically sequentially numbered throughout the system by the message switcher and are retrievable from the disc by the control operator, as an option.

Its purpose is to greatly speed communications between local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, as well as to provide inexpensive access, by small agencies, to criminal justice information contained on computer files at Dallas County, other city or county agencies, State of Texas, and Washington, D. C., (FBI). It has the potential of becoming one of the most beneficial tools for regional law enforcement and criminal information inquiries. The following users are presently connected to the regional switcher:
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Police Departments (Terminals):

- Burleson
- Forest Hills
- Terrell
- Lewisville
- Grapevine
- Carrollton
- McKinney
- Plano
- Greenville
- Waxahachie
- Lake Worth
- Richland Hills
- Crowley
- Stephenville
- Fort Worth
- Denton
- Irving
- Cleburne
- Hurst
- Richardson
- Arlington
- Dallas
- Denison
- Gainesville
- Farmers Branch
- Garland
- Grand Prairie
- Commerce
- N. Richland Hills
- Paris
- Euless
- Haltom City
- Sherman
- Southlake

Sheriff's Departments (Terminals):

- Kaufman
- Dallas

Computers:

- City of Dallas
- Dallas County
- Dallas County Switcher
- City of Ft. Worth

i. SUBSYSTEM INTERFACES

(1) Criminal Identification/Book-In and Custody

Direct input to the Criminal Name Index will, in the near future, be eliminated for persons booked into jail. This will be made possible by providing a reduced input which will eliminate the need to enter data redundant with the book-in master file.

(2) Book-In and Custody/Criminal Cases in Progress

As prisoners with outstanding warrants enter or are released from jail, or as cases are filed on prisoners in jail, the cases-in-progress file is updated automatically. This allows a certain amount of cross-file, cross-user validation, which includes validation of any dispositions entered in either subsystem.

This technique allows provision to the District Attorney of a list of defendant movement to and from jail and off and on bond, restricted to the prosecutor assigned to the case in question. It allows provision to prosecutors and to each court of a list of prisoners assigned to that prosecutor or court showing the status of that case and certain data not immediately available to either subsystem alone.

(3) Bonds/Criminal Cases in Progress

In addition to the interrelationships described in the section on Bonds, data entered to each bond packet is forwarded to the information packet on the corresponding case on a nightly basis to eliminate a significant redundant data entry and to ensure full cross-indexing between the two logical files.
CITY OF DALLAS INFORMATION SYSTEM CAPABILITIES

The City of Dallas Department of Data Services, managed by Roy L. Allen, provides systems analysis, programming, and computer processing services to all City departments. Assistance is provided to user departments in planning computer applications, and in designing and implementing systems to meet user department requirements. Major applications which Data Services has developed include the Water Customer Service Accounting and Information System, Tax Billing systems, systems for computer-assisted Police dispatching and for the North Central Texas Crime Information Center, Police Management Information System, Police Computer ID System, Traffic Engineering Data Base, Accounts Payable, Budgeting, Accounting, Personnel, and Payroll systems. The Data Services Department provides a full range of computer-related services for user departments. Management coordination is provided by a Data Processing Advisory Committee headed by the Director, Department of Data Services, and includes the heads of the largest users of computer services in the city. The Advisory Committee currently includes the Assistant City Manager-Administration, City Auditor, Director-Water Utilities Department, Police Chief, Director-Planning and Urban Development Department, Director-Traffic Control Department, and the Assistant to the City Manager-Management Services. In addition, monthly project reviews are held with user department management to review progress on Priority No. 1 Projects.

The Department of Data Services is divided into three major divisions: Systems and Programming, Operations, and Support. The following is a brief description of each division. (See organization chart, Figure III-12.)

Systems and Programming Division is responsible for conducting computer systems design, database administration, applications programming, and for documenting and maintaining programs contained in such systems. The development of new applications is carried out following a series of documentation-approval steps which ensure that the applications conform to user requirements and Data Services standards.

The Operations division of Data Services operates the City's centralized computer facility which contains two large-scale computers. This division is responsible for operating the City's computing equipment on a 24-hour-a-day, 7 day-a-week basis. Computer Operations also provides for the operation of the regional North Central Texas Crime Information Center network and a high speed line into FBI National Crime Information center; on-line teleprocessing for Water, Police, Public Works, Tax, and Traffic Control data bases; and satellite centers at 500 S. Ervay and 1500 W. Mockingbird. This division also provides keypunch services and batch processes data for all city departments, in addition to testing new or revised programs.

The Financial Control section is responsible for developing financial systems and for insuring that data is received by Data Services on time, that quality standards are maintained in processing, and that output is accurate and delivered to the user department on time. Control procedures are examined periodically to make improvements regarding the transmission and processing of user department data. Financial systems include payroll, personnel, accounts payable, budget, purchasing, and equipment and automotive services.

Another support section is Systems Programming which is responsible for OS and DOS systems generation, LINC development, software development, and technical support to operations and applications programming.

The current hardware capabilities of the City of Dallas are two IBM Model 370-145's, one serving as backup to the other, one IBM 1130 and one T.I. Mini-computer. The Data Center operates under both DOS and OS Operating Systems.

The Data Services Department has a total operating budget for 1972-1973 of $2,689,560. Services to the Dallas Police Department are budgeted at 18%. Six percent covers Municipal Court and two percent is budgeted for NCTCIC.
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There are two main information subsystems relative to law enforcement information maintained in the City of Dallas Computer System — North Central Texas Crime Information Center and the Information Network for Officers (INFO).

The NCTCIC is comprised of 20 law enforcement agencies in a four-county area around and including the Dallas Police Department. This system provides all users the capability to access and store information into regional, state and national files via their terminals. The national files consist of wanted persons, stolen vehicles, stolen boats, stolen securities and stolen license plates. Additional regional files are maintained on exceptional persons (those having a medical, physical and/or mental handicap that could possibly be given emergency assistance by an officer), persons wanted on felony warrant, misdemeanor warrants, and information regarding missing persons and runaways. The member law enforcement agencies of the NCTCIC network are:

**Police Departments:**
- Dallas
- Grand Prairie
- Highland Park
- Mesquite
- University Park
- Farmers Branch
- McKinney
- Arlington
- Denton
- Duncanville
- Garland
- Richardson
- Irving
- Ft. Worth
- Carrollton

**Other Agencies:**
- Tarrant County
- National Auto Theft Bureau
- Dallas County
- Department of Public Safety
- Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs

The regional members also have use of the Computer Identification System (CIS). This system was designed to assist in the identification and return of stolen property. Registration from citizens in the Greater Dallas area is made through satellite computer terminals into the central computer file. A citizen engravings his driver’s license number on his property, fills out a registration card and mails it in; thus his name and license number are then entered in CIS, thereby establishing ownership should any of his property be stolen and recovered.

Regional members may also input into a known offender system. When an inquiry on a suspect is made anywhere within the four-county region, the computer searches the Wanted Persons File, and if a hit is made on a known offender master record it is recorded on the real-time known offender file and produces a hard copy on the Dallas Police Department’s Intelligence Division’s printer terminal. This creates a historical tracking file for immediate inquiry via terminal concerning the whereabouts, actions, and associates of known offenders.

The Information Network for Officers (INFO) is a user-oriented, real-time computer software system comprised of a number of on-line subsystems and files designed to provide a broad base of easily retrievable information for officers and managerial personnel of the Dallas Police Department. The system receives both criminal and victim data through calls for service, offense reports, arrests and dispositions, and builds crime files and accident files. INFO consist of the following subsystems:
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a. COMPUTER ASSISTED DISPATCHING SYSTEM

This system pinpoints the address given by a citizen requesting police service to a particular beat and reporting area and identifies the patrol elements in the beat available to answer the call. This is accomplished by providing the police telephone clerks access and input to the files through a display terminal and providing each of the district dispatchers a video display terminal and a hard copy printer. Files utilized in the dispatching function are:

- Street Locator File (index of addresses to reporting area and beat).
- Markout File (identifies elements performing administrative duties).
- Unassigned and Assigned File (prevents entry of duplicate calls into the system and identifies calls received but not yet assigned).
- Unit Availability File (identifies the current status of the patrol element either on markout, answering a call, or available).
- Call File (computer record with a unique service number and containing the basic information pertaining to the call).

b. HAZARDOUS ADDRESS LOCATION (HAL)

The computerized HAL file is maintained by input from the various divisions of the police department. The automated dispatch system searches the HAL file and if the call location is flagged as hazardous, the dispatcher is notified via computer terminal when then alerts the officers being dispatched of the possible danger at the location.

c. OFFENSE/INCIDENT REPORTING SYSTEM

Each call for service is assigned an offense code or uniform crime reporting (UCR) code and entered into computer Call Record File which contains such information as type offense; location (street address or intersection); complainant name, age, race, sex, date/time of offense; call for service; dispatch; arrival and other initial incident information. From these records, the Offense Statistical Record is generated with additional data such as evidence and suspect information and victim-offender relationship. If the offense involves stolen property, a class of stolen property is assigned and a Supplemental Statistical Record (SSR) is created for reporting to the required agencies, on-line information for law enforcement operations and management requirements, and the capability of assessing the overall crime situation throughout the city.

d. ACCIDENT REPORTING SYSTEM

Calls for service concerning a traffic accident on public property requires a written accident report. The report is coded by the Report Section, the computer call record is updated and a new record is generated called the Accident Statistical Record (ASR). The ASR contains the location of the accident, the name of the driver of the first vehicle, the address of the first driver and all circumstances regarding the accident. All other persons involved are entered in a supplemental record called the Supplemental Accident Record (SAR). A number of reviews of the accident file are available.

e. CRIMINAL SYSTEM

The Criminal System receives, processes, and distributes arrest information in a real-time mode. The basic arrest data is used to create the file and initiate assignment of arrest numbers and booking cards. Presently the system receives, stores, and manipulates the following arrest-related information:

- Name, race, sex, DOB, and address of arrestee.
- Type offense or offenses charged with.
• Booking time, booking location, offense location and arrest time and location.
• Personal property arrested with and its location. (Being developed.)
• Court scheduling and disposition.
• Names and badge numbers of police personnel involved.

f. POLICE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (PMIS)

The PMIS system permits the review and retrieval of offense information from the
Offense Statistical Records. Reviews may be generated by UCR code, object of attack code,
and class property code. The crime data may be displayed for a period of one through thirty-
one days on a video terminal screen or printer by police district, beat or sector. The data
is maintained on-line for six months and will be expanded to 13 months. As the Criminal
System becomes fully operational the PMIS concept will be expanded, permitting reviews
and retrieval of selected arrest information and data.

g. POLICE PERSONNEL LOCATION SYSTEM

This system provides updates and access to a basic inventory of sworn and civilian per-
sonnel records which may be reviewed via terminal by badge number, payroll number or
name. A more sophisticated version of this system will be implemented in the future to
include a skills inventory, educational level, special interests, hobbies, foreign language, previous
departmental assignments, special awards and achievements, etc.

h. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FILE SYSTEM (BEING DEVELOPED)

The Dallas Police Department and the Southwest Institute of Forensic Science are
cooperating in establishing and maintaining a computerized evidence file. As physical evidence
is collected by the department, it is entered into the system. When the analysis of evidence
is completed, laboratory personnel update the evidence records enabling police investigators
to keep abreast of the evidence status by computer terminal inquiry.

i. LAW ENFORCEMENT ALARM DETECTION SYSTEM (LEADS) (BEING
DEVELOPED)

The LEADS system records reported offenses and when a pre-determined level of a
specified type of crime is reached within a given geographical boundary, a message showing
service number, UCR code, address, etc., for all offenses (contributing to the pre-determined
level attained) is automatically printed on terminals in the police district substations, the
Central Operations Analysis Unit and the Criminal Investigation Division office. This system
is flexible and directs corrective action information to the specified personnel.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS NEEDS

With the recent implementation of the regional switcher at Dallas County a link in local
criminal information systems has been established that greatly expands the potential for more
interagency information sharing. Certain software modifications are necessary to complete the
links between agencies' computer files. Initial steps have already taken place to enable the Dallas
Police Department to search the County's Name Index File for suspect information.

The recent implementation of the first phase of the Dallas Police Criminal System (on-line
arrest information) has enhanced the police data base and future plans for this system include
interfacing with Dallas County's Book-In System; expanding the arrest data base to include
information on suspects such as single or multiple offenders, prior arrest record, job or school
status, primary offense intended and disposition of arrestee; interfacing with the Dallas Police
Known Offenders System; software development to search specified files such as NCIC, NCTCIC,
County Criminal Name Index, state files, etc.; creating a Modus Operandi file; retrieval of
user-oriented, operational and management information and building historical arrest files.
The Dallas County Sheriff's Office presently has a critical records storage and retrieval problem considered to be a bottleneck in the criminal justice system. The current manual records keeping system presents a severe space problem due to the constantly growing files of ID jackets and booking cards.

Due to the high volume of activity, i.e., additions of 11,000 new jackets each year and updates of 35,000 each year, forty trustees are assigned to the central files section to maintain the files of more than 250,000 ID jackets. The feasibility of improving the system by microfilming and computerizing these records is presently being considered as a means of alleviating both the storage space problem and security concerns relative to use of inmates in the existing system.

Improvements presently being considered in the interest of modernizing and further enhancing other aspects of tele-communications and information systems are:

- System Integration to optimize records keeping, file structure and data access time.
- Reducing response time of calls for police service through more rapid digital communication with field elements.
- Replacing existing computer terminals with high-speed video terminals.
- Integrating the data base (to allow investigators more rapid, more comprehensive analysis) to eliminate redundant data sharing by multiple applications, faster implementation of new information needs and a scaling down of hardware, software, and personnel requirements.
- Developing a Business Administration Data Base to be used to exercise control over the acquisition and administration of criminal justice resources.
- Expansion of the Name Index File.
- Addition of the County Criminal Courts to the Judicial Information System.
- Developing an offense reporting system for the Dallas County Sheriff's Office.
- Expansion of police data base to include highly sensitive data not previously computerized.
CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has attempted to describe the criminal justice system in Dallas County and to summarize the system's strengths and weaknesses. Each component of the system exhibits needs of strengthening and upgrading. This does not imply that the system does not operate with commitment or dedication. The reference is rather one which identifies problems and needs resulting from workloads, technological advancements, and resources. Table III-20 exhibits the workloads of the system in Dallas County. This information has been discussed and analyzed in the various sections of this chapter. Efforts will continue to address those areas where the information is not available.
### TABLE III-20
Dallas Criminal Justice System Activity — 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Theft 0/SSO</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>Felony Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Crimes Known to Police</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>23,406</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>12,551</td>
<td>5,997</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Number of Arrests</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>7,091</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Clearance by Arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Number</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rate</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Prosecutor Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Grand Jury No Bill</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Grand Jury Indictment</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Disposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Guilty Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Guilty Plea</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Court or Jury</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lesser Charge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Acquitted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Dismissed</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Referred to Juvenile Authorities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cases Pending 12/31/71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Cases Pending 12/31/72</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III-20 (Continued)
Dallas Criminal Justice System Activity — 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. Probation</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Theft 0/50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>Felony Narcotics</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Granted</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Probation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No Previous Probation</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Revoked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Probation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No Previous Probation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IX. Committed to TDC | 1,384 Total (Not available by offense) |
|                      |                                    |

| X. Discharged/Paroled from TDC |                              |
| A. Paroled                   | 39     | 18   | 121    | 228     | 52      | 157      | 2         | 124             |
| B. Discharged                | 20     | 6    | 51     | 244     | 45      | 232      | 5         | 89              |

| XI. Committed to TYC         | 2      | 4    | 5      | 43      | **      | 3        | 29        | 12              |

*Not Available.

**Included in Assault to Murder, Assault to Rob, Assault to Rape, etc.

***Included in Theft Over $50.
IV. DALLAS AREA CRIMINAL JUSTICE GOALS

CENTRAL FILE
IV. DALLAS AREA CRIMINAL JUSTICE GOALS

A. ANNUAL ACTION PROGRAM

MULTI-YEAR GOAL I: REDUCE INDEX CRIMES IN THE DALLAS AREA BY 40% IN FIVE YEARS.

In recent years, the entire criminal justice system of Dallas County has made significant strides toward effectively curtailing and reducing the incidences of crime in the area. Indicative of the progress being made is the decrease in the crime rate that occurred in 1972. Crime in Dallas County decreased by 163.68 in 1972 based on the rate per 100,000. Early 1973 statistics indicate an additional decrease is possible this year.

Clearly, the Dallas area has placed itself on the offensive in its fight against crime. The willingness of the separate elements throughout the Dallas criminal justice system to insert improvements, and often innovations, into their various responsibilities has resulted in an aggressive fight to reduce crime. The success that has been achieved by past efforts must now be developed into a coordinated, sustained campaign to continue the present declining trend.

Of foremost concern in Dallas County is the rate that Index crimes occur. While 1972's decrease in the rate per 100,000 is heartening, Index crimes (murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, theft over $50 and auto theft) occurred at the rate of 4,022.03 per 100,000 during 1972, which warrants additional concerted efforts. There were 56,228 of these crimes recorded which averages to an Index crime being committed approximately each 9.35 minutes.

An overwhelming number of these crimes (80.4 percent) occur in the City of Dallas. The rate of Index crimes per 100,000 in the city was 5,149.54 in 1972, which exceeded all other cities in Texas. The Dallas Police Department recorded a 3 percent decrease in the Index crime rate in 1972, however, it is clear that further reductions must be made.

It was the excessive high rate of occurrence in both the city and the county that dictated the necessity of placing primary emphasis on the reduction of Index crimes. The fears for personal safety and concerns for property that accompanies these crimes can, if left unattended, promote and destroy the life source of this vigorous area.

Crimes against property are of particular concern. Burglary, theft over $50, and auto theft accounted for 84 percent of the 1972 Index crimes in Dallas County. Losses resulting from these three crimes exceeded $22 million in 1972. The Dallas Police Department alone recorded a loss in excess of $17 million.

The volume of occurrences of crimes against property must be given priority attention among all other considerations. The entire Dallas area criminal justice system will be exerting a major effort to effect a decrease in this category.

While the primary focus will be directed toward the crimes against property, the overall goal of reducing all Index crimes will be continuous. This is a necessary emphasis in that it is this one end toward which the Dallas criminal justice system's aim will be directed. An overall reduction in the 56,228 Index offenses that occurred in 1972 will receive constant attention from the entire Dallas criminal justice system.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

1. Reduce Index crimes in the Dallas area by 40 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

1. Reduce crimes against property by 15 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Utilize the City of Mesquite Police Community Services Team for educational programs on burglary prevention.

Provide crime scene search equipment for the Dallas County Sheriff’s Office.

Expand the activities of the Crime Prevention Education Unit in the Garland Police Department.

Expand the operations of the Selective Enforcement Unit and concentrate their efforts on the reduction of burglaries and theft over $50 in the City of Garland.

Establish a “Police Reporter” Unit in the Grand Prairie Police Department.

Establish a crime control monitoring capability in the Dallas Police Department to monitor known burglars.

Provide computerized offense tracking and reporting, evidence inventory and identification of suspects in Dallas County.

Improve the detection and apprehension of criminals by providing adequate information systems and communications equipment in the Dallas Police Department.

Create a helicopter unit for Mesquite Police Department.

OBJECTIVES

Reach 90% of all businesses and 75% of the residences during one year in the City of Mesquite with burglary and theft prevention programs.

Upgrade equipment and photography personnel to reduce turn-around from three days to two hours in order to increase response for detection and increase the apprehension rate by 10% in one year.

Inspect 450 businesses and reach 2,000 homeowners through neighborhood group meetings and make recommendations regarding crime prevention techniques in the first year.

Saturate selected areas to reduce burglaries and theft over $50 in those areas by 5% each in a three-month period.

Provide female police reporters to handle 800 routine calls and investigations during the first year.

Provide increased police presence in high burglary incidence areas to increase on-view arrests by 2% during the first year.

Inform 250 residences and 75 businesses of effective burglary prevention techniques during the first year.

Select the most active burglars in Dallas and monitor them until they are convicted of an Index crime or they become inactive.

Reduce time required for investigation of criminal offenses for prosecutors, sheriff’s deputies, and personnel of participating police agencies by 10% in one year.

Reduce response time to less than five minutes on all calls for service and increase effective allocation of police resources during the first year.

Increase arrest 10% of repeat offenders on certain offenses.

Reduce response time to Index crimes during peak crime periods from 10 minutes to three minutes in one year.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

1. Reduce Index crimes in the Dallas area by 40 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

1. Reduce crimes against property by 15 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Upgrade methods of identifying criminals, i.e., improve identification procedures for recovered and impounded property and vehicles in the Dallas Police Department.

Increase the efficiency of Mesquite Police Department through a detailed management study.

Establish three specialized units for the Sheriff's Office: Major Case Unit, Intelligence Unit, re-organize C.I.D.

Implement a burglary-in-progress detection system by utilizing portable burglar alarms in the City of Garland.

Improve the detection and apprehension of criminals by providing adequate information systems for the Garland Police Department.

OBJECTIVES

Increase arrest and conviction rate on Index crimes and increase recovery of victims' property during the first year.

Through increased efficiency of operations, increase the clearance rate of burglary and other Index offenses by 5%, increase Index crimes arrests by 5%, and reduce response time for all Index crimes to a maximum of five minutes within the first year.

Provide specialized in-depth investigative units to provide emphasis on Index crimes by the end of the first year.

Install portable crime sensing devices (burglar alarms) in 100 businesses during 1974.

Improve police response time by 10% on all calls for service and increase apprehensions of offenders by 5% in one year.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

1. Reduce Index crimes in the Dallas area by 40 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

2. Reduce Index crimes by 10 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Implement a Police Research and Planning Office in the City of Mesquite.

Provide continuation of administrative and legal support personnel for the seven Dallas County Criminal District Courts and four County Criminal Courts.

Provide a micro-film storage facility for the Record Section of the District Attorney’s Office and a retrieval system for the Sheriff’s Office. Increase storage capacity by 50%.

Provide a more complete library of reference material for the District Attorney’s Office.

Provide prosecutor/investigator alert communications system for District Attorney’s Office.

Provide legal advisor to Dallas County Sheriff’s Office.

Provide law internship program in the District Attorney’s Office.

Provide education and training seminars for prosecutors and investigators in the District Attorney’s Office.

Implementation of a Police Legal Advisor Program within the Mesquite Police Department.

OBJECTIVES

Utilize a Research and Planning Advisor to provide professional analysis of crime data to spot crime and burglary problems and to suggest trends and possible solutions. Increase the clearance rate for burglaries by 25% during the first year.

Provide identification of burglary suspects for field officers within 10 minutes and suspect determination within one day by the end of the first year if a burglary victim or witness has a general description of the offender.

Reduce case backlog by 30% and case disposition time to 90 days in one year.

Reduce the backlog of cases and increase the quality of prosecution of all cases by increasing storage facilities by 50% during the first year.

Accelerate prosecution ability to research legal matters thus reducing time of case preparation and improving the quality of prosecution in the first year.

Provide more efficient investigation of pending criminal cases for each of the nine Dallas County Criminal District Courts during the first year.

Improve efficiency in case preparation and increase successful prosecution of all cases during the first year.

Train 10 interns in the District Attorney’s office for briefing and other trial related duties in one year.

Increase efficiency in the prosecution of all criminal cases and the implementation of new trial techniques.

Increase effectiveness in prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of drug abuse offenders. Special attention to be given in preparation of search warrants and case reports of drug offenders. Reduce Dallas County Grand Jury’s “No Bill” action in drug abuse offenses from 27% to 15% and reduce the dismissal after indictment from 10% to 5% in one year.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

1. Reduce Index crimes in the Dallas area by 40 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

2. Reduce Index crimes by 10 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Provide additional bomb technicians and equipment in the Dallas County Sheriff's Office for detecting and disarming bombs.

Provide continuation of message switching capability between law enforcement agencies in the North Central Texas Region.

Provide increased capability for Records and Identification Section — Mesquite Police Department.

Continue rehabilitation of juveniles through the Rotary Town House in Dallas.

Create Specialized Crime Division in District Attorney's Office.

Establish a police cadet program in the Garland Police Department.

Implement a legal assistance capability in the Garland Police Department.

Establish a career development and job enrichment program in the Garland Police Department through implementation of an improved personnel administration system.

Expand law enforcement capability through technical equipment improvement in the Garland Police Department.

Improve the detection and apprehension of criminals by providing adequate information systems and communications equipment in the Dallas Police Department.

OBJECTIVES

Reduce bombing and bomb threats in Dallas County by 50%.

Reduce communication processing time by 50% during the first year.

Provide identification of Index crime suspects for field offices within 10 minutes and suspect determination provided within one day if an Index crime victim or witness has a general description of the offender.

Help rehabilitate approximately 24 boys over a three-year period.

Reduce the time from arrest to trial for Index crime offenders by 10% in three years.

Recruit 12 high school graduates desiring law enforcement careers and provide them with part-time jobs and financial assistance for college.

Improve the case acceptance rate and increase the number of cases in which convictions are obtained by 10%.

Reduce personnel turnover by 10% by providing challenges and improving morale.

Purchase equipment for use in surveillance, detection and apprehension and security to accomplish a 5% reduction of Index crimes during the first year.

Reduce response time to less than five minutes on all calls for service and increase effective allocation of police resources during the first year.
MULTI-YEAR GOAL II: REDUCE CRIMES COMMITTED BY REPEAT OFFENDERS BY 50% IN FIVE YEARS.

In an effort to analyze the root factors which contribute to crime in Dallas, the Planning and Research Division of the Dallas Police Department conducted a study which focused on the repeat offender. After surveying both felons arrested in Dallas and inmates in the Texas Department of Corrections sentenced from Dallas, it was found that:

- Arrest statistics indicate that almost 60 percent of the suspects filed on by the Dallas Police Department are repeat offenders. Furthermore, they are responsible for 90 percent of the multiple clearances recorded and the commission of 99 percent of the offenses admitted by prison inmates.

- During 1971, repeat offenders were responsible for approximately 22,750 Index crimes which was slightly less than half of the total recorded in the city during the year.

- Almost 70 percent of the persons charged with burglary were repeat offenders, and 64.5 percent of the persons charged with robbery were repeaters.

- Lack of continuity of information on criminal cases to permit measurement, evaluation and correction of problems in the criminal justice system in Dallas.

- Only one-half of the cases cleared by arrest are actually filed with the District Attorney or Juvenile Court.

- It is possible for repeat offenders to amass bonds and continue their criminal activities while awaiting trial.

- No systematic method exists where cases against repeat offenders can be disposed of quickly and routinely.

- An overwhelming majority of multiple offenders receive concurrent sentences for the crimes they commit.

Coupled with this data, information from the Texas Department of Corrections reveals that almost 38 percent of all Dallas County inmates incarcerated on February 1, 1973, had served at least one prior conviction in the Texas prison system. In addition, 35 percent of these same inmates had been confined in at least one detention home, 25 percent in juvenile reformatories, and 75 percent had prior misdemeanor jail sentences.

From this data, the need for this goal is supported in three parts. First, with the repeat offenders being responsible for one-half of all Dallas crime, any attack on this category of offenders would result in a noticeable decrease in criminal offenses in Dallas. Second, repeat offenders strike both the felony and misdemeanor levels of the law. With the relation to Index offenses mentioned above, it is noted that offenders in the petty thefts, shoplifting, minor assault, etc., categories are highly repetitive and a drain on the entire criminal justice system.

The last contention of this goal is that the repeat offender is a problem from arrest through incarceration. This goal thus attacks the problem through upgrading each agency involved, from law enforcement and juvenile enforcement agencies through the prosecution, courts, and the correctional system.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

II. Reduce crimes committed by repeat offenders by 50 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

1. Reduce Index crimes committed by repeat offenders by 20 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Restructure and expand Juvenile Prosecution Section in the District Attorney's Office.

OBJECTIVES

Reduce by 10% the time period from notification to disposition in juvenile cases referred to the District Attorney's Office in one year.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

II. Reduce crimes committed by repeat offenders by 50 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

2. Reduce misdemeanors by repeat offenders by 10 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Provide needed jail alterations and programs to increase education opportunities for Dallas County inmates.

Implement a judicial information system for the four Dallas County Criminal Courts.

Implement "Style of Case Index" for the four Dallas County Criminal Courts.

Provide master console radios and other communication equipment to upgrade the system in the Sheriff's Office.

OBJECTIVES

Provide educational programs for 50-70 jail inmates, two classrooms and a jail library in the first year.

Provide statistical and tracking data of all cases in the Dallas County Criminal Courts in three years.

Increase the timely deliverance of case status information to the four Dallas County Criminal Courts during the first year.

Increase the apprehension of offenders by 50% in one year.
MULTI-YEAR GOAL III: REDUCE DRUG ABUSE AND ORGANIZED CRIME ACTIVITY BY 30% IN FIVE YEARS.

The link between drug abuse and organized crime to Dallas area crime conditions has been well documented. The increasing use of narcotics has had a direct connection with a substantial portion of the 56,228 Index crimes that occurred in Dallas County in 1972. In addition, the connection between drugs and repeat offenders has also received a high correlation.

The number of drug-related arrests increased more than 300 percent from 1966 to 1971 and cases filed increased more than 800 percent during the same period. A concerted effort to reduce the number of drug abuse offenders will result in a substantial decrease in the number of Index crimes committed. A study conducted by the Dallas Police Department in 1972 found that 46.6 percent of all crime in the City of Dallas was drug related. High correlations were found to exist between drugs and burglary and robbery.

Likewise, organized criminal activity is responsible for a major supporting role in this area’s crime picture. The organized elements that deal in drug traffic and the fencing of stolen property contribute greatly to the overall crime rate in Dallas County.

An example of an organized criminal group which engages in the commission of all types of street crimes is the motorcycle gangs. These gangs have actively engaged in organized efforts to commit robberies, burglaries, auto thefts, and narcotic trafficking. Detection and reduction of the impact on crime which groups such as these are having requires a concerted effort by all the various criminal justice agencies.

The social effects of drug abuse and organized crime are such that both tend to undermine the overall effort to reduce crime. A narcotic addict’s desire to obtain drugs knows no limits and often leads him to the desperate stage of doing virtually anything to satisfy his addiction.

Organized crime preys on the exploitation of innocent citizens and competing organizations. While organized crime may be responsible for the commission of many common crimes as mentioned previously, its nature is such that, as a planned conspiracy, it can remain flexible enough to take advantage of an opportunity that will suit its cause. Its ability, then, to supply illegal goods and services can be far reaching and if left unchecked can subvert any real attempts to reduce crime in the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTI-YEAR GOALS</th>
<th>CRIME ORIENTED GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. Reduce drug abuse and organized crime activity by 30 percent in five years.</td>
<td>1. Reduce drug related crimes by 20 percent in one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGIES

Utilize the City of Mesquite's Crime Scene Search Unit to increase apprehension of burglary suspects.

Establish an effective program to curtail the truancy rate in Garland Public Schools.

Utilize the City of Mesquite Police Community Service Team to inform schools and community groups of the dangers of drug abuse.

Create Canine Corps in the Dallas County Sheriff's Office.

Establish expanded Narcotics Squad in the Grand Prairie Police Department.

OBJECTIVES

Increase the response to a reported burglary from 32% to 75% in one year.

Through close cooperation between the police department and the school system initiate and maintain programs to reduce the truancy rate by 50% in 1974 and thereby reduce daytime burglaries and theft over $50.

Reach 100% of all children attending public schools and 90-100% of all organized community groups to make the general public aware of existing problems in the first year.

Purchase four dogs for use in detection of drugs and in search for fugitives during the first year.

Produce Drug Abuse programs for presentation to 15 elementary, 4 junior high and 2 senior high schools in Grand Prairie during the first year.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

III. Reduce drug abuse and organized crime activity by 30 percent in five years.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

2. Reduce the incidence of organized crime activity by 10 percent in one year.
STRATEGIES

Prevent and reduce organized crime activities through a program of public education in the City of Dallas.

OBJECTIVES

Develop a public education program for the Dallas area dealing with the existence, recognition, and citizens action regarding organized crime during the first year of the project.
MULTI-YEAR GOAL IV: STRENGTHEN DALLAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM-COMMUNITY RELATIONS.

A multi-year goal of the Dallas area is to strengthen Dallas criminal justice system-community relations. For the criminal justice system to be more effective, an improvement in relations with the general citizenry is essential. Mutual trust between the citizenry and the criminal justice system will help to avoid a lack of confidence in the system. Public respect for law enforcement may be strengthened through developing new channels of communication and combating alienation of minorities, increasing positive public contact with the criminal justice system, and adequately responding to citizen grievances and complaints. Public involvement in law enforcement is critical to the future development and improvement of the criminal justice system.

The potential for violence and racial conflict is not a new phenomenon in the United States. Most of the major civil disorders of the sixties were a particular expression of the frustration, hostility, and alienation minorities experienced as a result of social, economic and political inequities in American society. Almost all of the past civil disturbances were sparked by an encounter between the police and a member of a minority group. In most instances, these encounters were trivial; in many, police were responding to a complaint called in by a Negro and acted with propriety. However, the strain between police and minority members and the tension and hostility existing among many members of the community were integral elements in the civil disorders.

Although the Dallas area has not experienced any major civil disorders, several demonstrations have occurred within the past year. These events indicate that tension and discontentment among minority members exists within the area. The high concentration of racial and ethnic minorities in the Dallas urban area yields potential that a civil disturbance has a possibility of occurring. Experience has shown that major civil disorders are often generated by commonly shared grievances among minority groups, inadequate communication channels, and inadequate response to citizens' grievances.

It is a goal of the Dallas area to strengthen police community relations to the extent that no major civil disturbance occurs. The strengthening of police community relations will contribute to the reduction of tension and hostility which contribute to civil disturbances. A greater positive interaction between the police and the citizen is possible. A mutual commitment of the police and the community to a safer environment will alleviate the situations which could result in civil disturbances.

Strategies aimed at assuring that no major civil disturbance occurs will place emphasis on police training, recruitment of minorities, responding to citizens' complaints, planning, equipment, and improvement of police communications with minority communities.

There is a need to upgrade law enforcement personnel through adequate recruiting and in-service training for all police officers. By providing officers with advanced and thorough training, the police will accomplish two objectives. First, it will provide the officer with a sufficient amount of training so that the officer feels competent and comfortable in intensive disturbance situations. Another benefit is that if the public is made aware of the complete firearms training of police officers, the public will have more confidence in the officer's ability to couple discretion and skill in situations that might lead to conflict or a civil disturbance.

In the area of recruitment, there is a need to increase the employment of minority persons. Qualified minority group members can be hired as police, public service, community service officers and as civilians in administrative positions. An objective is to employ minorities in the same ratio of minority employees to population ratio.

Another strategy that would be beneficial is to increase the ability of police to prevent and control civil disorder by expeditious handling of citizens' complaints. Failure to respond quickly to the complaints made by citizens, especially those dealing with a tense situation, could bring about
a great deal of chaos. By increasing and improving the ability to establish fair and objective procedures for handling citizen complaints, the possibility of civil disorders is reduced. However, if complaints are ignored or not given adequate attention, outbreak of a violent nature may very well occur.

There is a need to increase the ability of police to prevent and control civil disorders by planning, training, and equipping police agencies. With a well planned training program and necessary equipment, officers can become more proficient in riot control techniques. Should a civil disturbance break out, officers may be sent in to control and contain the disturbance. Thus preventing a minor demonstration from evolving into a major civil disturbance.

There should be a coordination with the Dallas Independent School District to allow a uniform officer access to predominantly minority classroom to provide positive police influence to minority juveniles. Recently, there have been problems in keeping order in some of the schools in Dallas. The mere presence of an officer in a school, and the rapport that would be built up between the students and officer would be invaluable in improving police community relations and discouraging life styles which might lead to crime.
MULTI-YEAR GOALS

IV. Strengthen Dallas Criminal Justice System — Community Relations.

CRIME ORIENTED GOALS

1. Strengthen Dallas Police Department community relations to the extent that no major civil disorder occurs.
STRATEGIES

Upgrade Dallas County law enforcement personnel through professional college education.

Strengthen Dallas police community relations by upgrading law enforcement personnel adequate recruit and in-service training.

Upgrade Dallas Police Department managerial skills by conducting a police administrator's management workshop.

OBJECTIVES

Increase the number of professionally educated deputies in the Dallas Sheriff's Office in the first year.

Improve each Dallas Police Department officer's decision making ability and skill regarding use of firearms. Enhance the managerial competencies of 150 Dallas Police Department supervisors in one year.

Enhance the managerial competency of 150 Dallas Police Department supervisors.
B. IMPACT PROGRAM

1. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

**CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 1.0: REDUCE BURGLARY IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 8% IN ONE YEAR.**

**OBJECTIVES:**

1. Reduce the time required to determine Impact crime problems and offense/offender concentrations and patterns from eight days to immediate recognition.
2. Increase recovery and identification of all stolen property by 10% and return to rightful owners.
3. Increase identification of all known sources of stolen property disposal by 10%.
4. Locate, identify, and prosecute an additional 25% of receivers and concealers of stolen property.
5. Educate 30% (261,000) of the population in means of Impact crime reduction.
6. Increase on-the-scene arrests of Impact offenders by 100% over routine patrol deployment.
7. Reduce response time to each Impact offense in an assigned target area to three minutes.
8. Increase and improve case preparation to effect a 10% increase in true bills.
9. Increase and improve case preparation to effect a 10% increase in convictions.
10. Increase the aggregate Impact offense clearance rate, with case filed, by 10% during the second full year of operation of the Impact Program.
CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 2.0: REDUCE STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES OF MURDER, RAPE, ROBBERY, AND AGGRAVATED ASSAULT IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 2% IN ONE YEAR.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Increase the clearance rate of murders by one percent (from 92 to 93 percent) in one year.
2. Increase the clearance rate of robbery offenses by 5 percent (from 37 to 42 percent) in one year.
3. Increase the clearance rate of rape offenses by 5 percent (from 66 to 71 percent) in one year.
4. Reduce Impact crimes committed by “traveling criminals” by 10 percent.
5. Increase crime laboratory productivity and increase the speed of reporting results to law enforcement agencies from over two days to ten minutes.
6. Increase in-service training for personnel involved in the scientific investigation of crime and death in the Institute of Forensic Sciences.
7. Increase training of 1,700 law enforcement officers and forensic scientists in physical evidence and scientific crime and death investigation.
8. Perform approximately 8,200 tests and analyses on evidence submitted to the criminalistic lab during the first year.
9. Reduce average inquiry response time into the Regional Criminal Information System from an average of over 20 seconds to five seconds or less, and maintain this reduced level.
CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 3.0: REDUCE JUVENILE RELATED STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 3% IN ONE YEAR.

OBJECTIVES:
1. Reduce the number of referrals to the Juvenile Department by 10 percent or 590 juveniles during the first 16 months and by 30 percent or 1,770 juveniles by the third year.
2. Reduce juvenile recidivism by three percent to 43.79 during the first 16 months and by 10 percent to 36.79 over three years.
3. Reduce the number of Impact related offenses committed by juveniles by three percent or 62 during the first 16 months and by 6 percent or 124 over three years.
4. Provide needed service to approximately 3,050 youths who have not been arrested during the first 16 months and 9,150 over three years.
5. Reduce the time lapse between referral and disposition of juvenile offenders by 8 percent in three years.
6. Reduce juvenile court processing time by 8% in three years. (1 percent first year, 4 percent second year, 8 percent third year.)
7. Increase counseling and supervisory services to juvenile offenders and their families by 50 percent in three years. (30 percent in the first year, 40 percent the second year, 50 percent third year.)
8. Provide four additional alternatives for the Juvenile Justice System in dealing with delinquents.
9. Reduce juvenile department referral recidivism rates by 8 percent in three years.
10. Reduce the recidivism rate of delinquents participating in Impact projects by 50 percent as compared to the rate of non-participating delinquents.
11. Reduce response time to emergency medical situations within the Detention Home by 10 percent by December 31, 1975.
12. Reduce the time between initial detention and final adjudication of juvenile offenders by 2 percent by December 31, 1975.
13. Increase psychological testing, psychological evaluation, and rehabilitative counseling by 50 percent by December 31, 1975.
CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 4.0: REDUCE DRUG RELATED STRANGER-TO-STRANGER
CRIMES AND BURGLARY IN THE CITY OF DALLAS
BY 3% IN ONE YEAR.

OBJECTIVES:
1. Reduce illegal drug supplies by five percent in the first year and 20 percent in three years.
2. Reduce the increase of drug addiction by 5 percent in the first year and 20 percent in three years.
3. Increase drug intelligence capabilities in the areas of organized crime.
4. Provide diversion and treatment for 474 identified opiate addicts.
5. Achieve a 50 percent success rate in the treatment of 474 arrested addicts.
6. Reduce the rate of criminal recidivism among those who successfully complete treatment by 75 percent.
CRIME-Oriented GOAL 5.0: REDUCE STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY COMMITTED BY REPEAT OFFENDERS IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 5% IN ONE YEAR.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Reduce dismissals after indictment from 18 percent to 12 percent.
2. Reduce the Dallas County Grand Jury’s “no bill” action in stranger-to-stranger crimes from the current rate of 30 percent to a figure of 20 percent.
3. Reduce the time necessary for preparation of legal documents for use in all stages of prosecution to 24 hours in one year.
4. Provide short term residential facilities for 90 ex-offenders during the first year.
5. Provide counseling services and referrals to community resources for 210 ex-offenders. (Alcoholics Anonymous, Mental Health, Mental Retardation, Etc.)
6. Increase the rate of appearance at trial of persons released on bond.
7. Reduce the number of repeat Impact offenses by persons on release while awaiting trial by 25 percent.
8. Provide swifter justice by reducing the elapsed time between filing and disposition of felony cases by October, 1973, from the present average of 271 days to 180 days, and to reduce this time to 90 days by October, 1975.
9. Reduce the average length of stay of Impact inmates in the county jail with a resultant decrease in the jail population by 10 percent.
10. Provide law enforcement personnel from both Dallas County Sheriff’s Office and the Dallas Police Department 3400 manhours of training closely related to their work and the effective prosecution of stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.
11. Reduce book-in time at the county jail from four hours to two hours.
12. Reduce the average time necessary to conduct a pre-probation investigation by 50 percent (from four hours to two hours).
13. Reduce case loads in the Dallas County Adult Probation Department from 290 to 178 by December 31, 1973, to 155 by December 31, 1974, and maintain that level in 1975.
15. Provide job placements for 330 ex-offenders during the first year.
16. Reduce repeat offenses committed by persons awaiting trial by 10 percent.
2. STRATEGIES

IMPACT STRATEGY A REDUCE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMISSION OF STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY.

This strategy is directed at making the targets of crime more difficult to exploit and penetrate by systematically installing devices designed to make residential and commercial buildings more secure, and by making the setting in which crime occurs less advantageous to the offender. Business concerns, private homeowners and property renters neglect to take the necessary precautionary steps to prevent illegal entry, thus contributing to the rapid increase of burglaries in Dallas.

This strategy will continue to incorporate a target hardening project which is directed toward hardening the targets which contribute to high robbery and burglary rates.

The systematic installation of materials and devices designed to secure buildings in order to protect property and persons against burglary and robbery will be accomplished. This will be supported by personal contacts designed to train, educate, and recommend the selection of specific combinations of security items that would serve to substantially reduce the chances of successful commission of stranger-to-stranger and burglary crimes.

This strategy will also decrease the vulnerability to criminal activity of public places such as streets, thoroughfares, parks, and entrances to both residential and commercial establishments. This represents an attempt to curb commission of stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary offenses. The vulnerability of these places will be decreased in an effort to provide both police and citizens a greater opportunity to deter and detect potential offenders.

This strategy will also address the need to inform the public on methods of crime prevention and the role of the citizen in the detection of crime. Citizens who are frequently apathetic or uninformed about their role in the criminal justice system will be motivated to aid the police in the prevention and detection of crime and the apprehension of offenders. This strategy will also assist the public by identifying personal security and safety precautions which can be taken to reduce their vulnerability to criminal attack. Identified problems of burglary, assault and rape can be reduced through projects designed to inform and assist the general public, business proprietors and other identified crime targets in protecting themselves.

This strategy will also be developed and implemented as a companion to the Dallas Treatment Alternative to Custody project and the Comprehensive Drug Treatment Program funded by the National Institute of Mental Health by providing the necessary support required in the detection and apprehension of drug addicts. Other issues addressed will include public education, citizen cooperation, possible diversion of first offenders, coordination of community efforts, and the establishment of public education, citizen cooperation, possible diversion of first offenders, coordination of community efforts, and the establishment of departmental policies, procedures and training.

IMPACT STRATEGY B INCREASE THE RISK OF COMMITTING STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY.

The police are the most visible representatives of local government in a society marked by social unrest, rising crime and institutional change; yet the resources available to police departments are being stretched beyond the level of effectiveness. Many agencies find themselves hard-pressed to deliver the quality and quantity of law enforcement services demanded by society. Therefore, improving the operational performance of the Dallas Police Department through the introduction of modern and innovative techniques will strengthen the ties between the police and the community and will provide more adequate law enforcement service to all citizens. The
projects under this strategy are designed to increase the efficiency of the department in the detection and apprehension of criminals committing stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary and to strengthen police/community relations.

Local investigative units will be encouraged to continue to implement new operational techniques. The development of new techniques that will assist investigators and investigative units in their ability to solve crime will be promoted. In addition, investigative efforts will be supported by the development of necessary computer projects that will be designed to provide a complete network of intelligence and identification information. The coordination of the Dallas City/County information networks with that of the Department of Public Safety and other law enforcement agencies will be directed toward providing necessary investigative information in a timely manner closely related to the needs of investigative, apprehension, detection, and other enforcement efforts.

This strategy will also continue to increase the visibility of law enforcement personnel so that they will serve as a deterrent to crime thus increasing the risk (both perceived and real) of committing a crime in the area. The presence of law enforcement officers in required high visibility areas will also decrease response time and consequently increase the apprehension rate of offenders.

Communication systems which support increased visibility will be developed to provide communications between law enforcement agencies in the area. A “911” Emergency Communications System will be developed and implemented to support the communication network in order to improve crime reporting capabilities and take advantage of the information exchange capabilities of law enforcement agencies.

This strategy will also continue to assist the Dallas Police Department to transform from reactionary response to analytical crime prediction and aggressive prevention. Projects in this strategy will directly support the effective application of police resources, including manpower, money and equipment, all of which will directly support the preventive and apprehension efforts in Dallas.

**IMPACT STRATEGY C IMPROVE GOVERNMENTAL ABILITY TO RESPOND TO STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY.**

This strategy is directed at providing the capability to seek, develop, test, and implement new and improved responses to crime in Dallas. The conditions relating to crime dramatize the need for improvement in virtually every phase and discipline of the criminal justice system. The application of today’s science and technology so vividly evident in all other aspects of the environment is probably the most critical criminal justice need. Historical and traditional methods have become increasingly obsolete as conditions in our society constantly change, and our total response to change must be continually evaluated and improved.

This strategy provides for increasing the education, vocational, and planning and research skill levels of persons employed in the criminal justice system and increasing their abilities to more effectively respond to stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.

Projects will be developed for the purpose of strengthening agency abilities in interpersonal relations with all elements of society in Dallas through cultural understanding, group action and crisis intervention. Two projects designed to improve police operations are the Police Service Expediter Unit and the Legal Aides for Police.

A Planning and Research Project will be designed to analyze juvenile crime problems and propose correctional techniques and recommendations for the overall improvement of the Juvenile Department’s ability to meet the needs of juvenile offenders.

Projects addressing this strategy will also relate to the development of capabilities to track particular offender groups through the criminal justice system, new case input techniques and processing for stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.
Projects with direct application to the strategy will include organizational reviews and procedures streamlining. This streamlining will more effectively coordinate the activities of the Police Department, the District Attorney's Office and the Criminal District Courts in the processing of cases.

The establishment of two temporary District Courts, recently funded, provides for an Administrative Manager in the District Attorney's Office. Previously, administrative responsibilities were handled by the First Assistant District Attorney and three Chief Felony Prosecutors, whose courtroom duties had suffered considerably. The responsibilities of the Administrative Manager are: Project planning; development and monitoring of grant projects; assistance in clerical personnel; evaluation of federally funded projects; program coordination with other agencies and coordination with the Court Administrator to insure that the needs of the courts are being met.

The Juvenile Department Court Action Processing Unit project involves a reorganization and expansion of the Dallas County Juvenile Department to effect a decrease in referral recidivism and increased efficiency in the Department's services.

Installation of the Word Processing System for the District Attorney's Office will increase the efficiency of preparation of legal documents for the adjudication function.

This strategy also provides for computerization of data not readily available through existing information systems to enable Dallas area agencies to perform more effectively criminal justice planning, analysis and evaluation.

Expansion of the Dallas Police Department Data Base, recently implemented, has provided the capability of flagging stranger-to-stranger crimes, consequently permitting the reporting of Impact crime statistics for 1973.

Additional projects in this program area will expand computer capabilities and develop information systems to support the analysis and evaluation needs of other Impact projects.

The Upgrade Response of Criminal Justice System project recently implemented at Dallas County has increased the efficiency of inquiry responses to the Regional Criminal Justice System, enhancing the capability of regional users to obtain more rapid information from these regional criminal information files.

The recent implementation of the two temporary District Courts includes modifications to Regional Criminal Justice System programs and files that will provide for computerized data relative to Impact cases in all Dallas Criminal District Courts. This will aid in the evaluation of that project as well as provide an overall analysis capability of the courts function.

This strategy also includes projects to improve the services of the Dallas Institute of Forensic Sciences. The Criminalistics Lab offers facilities to all law enforcement agencies in the North Central Texas area, and has the potential of becoming one of the outstanding forensic science institutes in the nation.

Training for area law enforcement personnel in the handling and preservation of "good" evidence, modern electronic equipment to enhance crime detection and evidence analysis and computer equipment and software to improve the quality of evidence analysis and speed the dissemination of data will effect speedier trial dispositions of cases requiring Crime Lab services.

**IMPACT STRATEGY D  PREPARE AND ASSIST OFFENDERS TO REENTER SOCIETY.**

This strategy will focus upon the need to alter the criminal behavior patterns of offenders by improving the effectiveness of the correctional system in dealing with the specific needs and problems of the offender. Programs have been established to take direct action with offenders by rehabilitating them for successful integration into society. This strategy will be attained through
Impact projects geared toward improving the coordination and provision of services through probation, the jail system, alternatives to incarceration, and community-based correctional programs.

This strategy strengthens probation services through increased manpower and improved technology in an effort to reduce reliance on institutional control of the convicted offender. Provision for closer and more systematic liaison for decision making between police, prosecution, courts, probation, and parole functions is provided. This will be accomplished by offender-oriented programs and services implemented through the Adult Probation Department and various other alternatives to incarceration. In addition to increased staff positions, the department is preparing a computer monitoring system to aid in the tracking of adult probationers.

This strategy will also initiate comprehensive services for juveniles in the Dallas area. Each project in this section is aimed at diverting pre-delinquents (i.e., non-criminal juvenile misconduct cases) from the present juvenile justice system. This program will address delinquency, which stems from numerous conditions, and will be aimed at prevention and rehabilitation. These efforts must be multi-faceted in order to detect and deal with problems of which truancy and withdrawal from school are only symptoms. Emphasis has been placed on increasing service delivery to area youths, while at the same time reducing the stigma of receiving this help.

It is anticipated that the apprehension of offenders will increase during the Impact Program with a resultant increase in the number of incarcerated offenders awaiting court disposition. In order to reduce the attendant reliance on institutional control of rehabilitation programs and gain support of the community through greater confidence of the public in community-based programs, more effective tools and techniques must be developed and implemented. There should, therefore, be a corresponding increase in pre- and post-trial programs which will address not only the symptoms of crime, but also the causal factors.

One key factor in this strategy is the reintegration of the offender into the community. Outreach projects, residential treatment centers, and employment will all be emphasized. These efforts will generate resources from within the community which will support employment opportunities for offenders. In conjunction with the project to expand Dallas County Adult Probation Department services, an Employment/Community Relations Specialist is being provided to assist offenders in matters relating to employment. Vocational rehabilitation efforts will be undertaken to assist those persons who lack marketable skills which can be employed in Dallas. The vocational program will be coordinated with vocational training opportunities available through the Dallas Independent School District. Therefore, the program will make use of the existing facilities and resources within the community to meet the needs of the offenders. Through coordination with the local schools, this program will enable offenders to receive vocational training as a part of their total rehabilitative program.

**IMPACT STRATEGY E ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS WHICH PROMOTE STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY.**

This strategy will address socio-environmental deficiencies, such as high unemployment, deplorable living conditions, and poor educational and vocational training opportunities which contribute to the rising crime rate. In addition, poor mental hygiene, coupled with drug addiction and other similar character disorders, push these rising crime rates even higher. This strategy is also designed to provide offenders and potential offenders with marketable skills. Various alternatives to incarceration are proposed for offenders.

This strategy is being supported by the expansion of services offered through the Dallas County Adult Probation Department and Juvenile Probation Department. Identified problems also substantiate the need for support of this program by agencies which lie outside the realm of services provided by the criminal justice system. It is anticipated that support of these objectives...
will also be gained from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Department of Labor, the Emergency Employment Agency, and other programs directed at job opportunities, through the development of training programs and programs designed to improve the living environment of offenders in Dallas.

Projects directed at improving the skill level of offenders and increasing the basic educational achievement levels of offenders will be implemented in this program. These services include job training, employment counseling, and job placement. The costs of these services are absorbed in the Adult Probation Department Expansion of Services Project. Vocational counseling and assistance will also be provided by the Dallas Treatment Alternatives to Custody Program and the Crisis Intervention Program.

This strategy also provides for the implementation of a general public information program designed to educate citizens regarding the importance of the criminal justice system to personal security and combat minority alienation.

A grant will be made through the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council to develop and implement a Comprehensive Public Information Program, which will support all efforts and projects implemented under the Impact Program. The general objectives will be to educate the citizenry concerning the problems of crime in Dallas, the need for support from the community to the criminal justice system and in the rehabilitation of offenders reentering the Dallas community.

In an effort to open channels of communication with minorities, various alternatives have been explored in an attempt to improve police/minority relations within this segment of the community. Under this program a project has been designed by the Dallas Police Department to provide activities such as athletics, scouting, etc., in an attempt to bring about a favorable attitude by Dallas youths, especially those from the low income and minority areas, thus allowing the police department to improve its image and gain greater community support.

This strategy will also implement an expansion of the Beat Committee concept which solicits support and assistance for the police through the organization of citizens crime fighting committees throughout the city. This will establish a rapport between the citizens and the police enabling a more mutual understanding of community expectations and police problems creating a “partnership” which will work toward the immediate reduction of crime and tension in each neighborhood.

In addition, a professional education consultant will be hired on a contract basis to design police programs aimed at public education and to supervise the training of sworn personnel to carry out these programs as well as to measure their effectiveness. Another facet of this program will be to create a greater public awareness of crime through public advertising with radio spot ads, prime television commercials, and other media campaigns.

This strategy also provides supplementary and complementary services which will develop counseling and psychotherapeutic services relating to the treatment of mental hygiene and psychological problems. This strategy will directly contribute to and support the total rehabilitative services of existing criminal justice programs. This strategy will also address the need to provide empirical research and to develop innovative projects directed toward the suppression of drug related offenses. Methods will be developed to identify and track members of the Dallas drug population and offer treatment alternatives to incarceration for their rehabilitation.
V. EVALUATION PLAN
V. EVALUATION PLAN

All annual action projects in the Dallas area will be evaluated in an effort to measure the effectiveness of these criminal justice projects through related quantitative performance measures and qualitative judgements. The philosophy of the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council is that evaluation has a positive influence on improving and balancing the criminal justice system when the evaluation mechanism is based on sound performance objectives.

The Dallas evaluation system will be structured to be closely related to the planning and administrative process and should provide a clear picture of the strengths and weaknesses, successes and shortcomings of criminal justice planning in the Dallas area. Evaluation results will be fed back into the planning process to help determine the most effective means of addressing the defined project goals, strategies, and objectives. Evaluation will also provide feedback to the annual action project managers for any necessary corrective action to assure that projects proceed in accordance with their plan.

A. DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION COMPONENT

Each annual action project will be required to include an evaluation component within each project application. This evaluation component will: (See following outline)

- Provide crime-specific analysis and problem identification to illustrate the need for the specific project and point out the objectives that must be accomplished to attack the specific problem(s) addressed in the project application.
- Restate the project objectives in order to maintain the perspective of the evaluation measures to the desired results of the project.
- Identify the evaluation measures to be used. Two types of evaluation measures will be used for assessing levels of achievement. Efficiency measures indicate how well a project or program is executed according to plan in terms of schedule, manpower and equipment allocation, activities and expenditures. Effectiveness measures are used to evaluate the impact of project and program activities or the results attained in terms of crime rate reduction and cost/benefit considerations.
- Indicate a listing of needed data elements required to apply these evaluation measures.
- Spell out the planned sources of data acquisition, indicating how it will be collected and how it will be managed.
- Address frequency of reporting evaluation data (i.e., monthly, quarterly).
- Describe the methods of analysis of the evaluation data for that particular block grant project. Diagnostic analysis will permit the determination of reasons for the success or failure of the project.
OUTLINE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ANNUAL ACTION PROJECT EVALUATION COMPONENT

PREREQUISITES

Crime Specific Analysis/Problem Identification

1. Definition
2. Quantification
3. Project Development

I. Define Objectives
   A. State desired achievement/expected results
   B. Quantify expected levels of achievement
   C. State period of time covered

II. Develop Evaluation Measures
   A. Measures of effectiveness
   B. Measures of efficiency
   C. Definitions

III. Develop Data Requirements
   A. List data elements
   B. Define key terms
   C. Identify data sources

IV. Develop Methods of Analysis
   A. Timing (address frequency of reporting)
   B. Techniques (narrative interpretation of data)
B. TYPICAL EVALUATION MEASURES

The following is a description of some of the typical evaluation measures that might be included in the evaluation component and used by the project director in assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of annual action projects. This list is included only as a suggestion for possible evaluation measures and is not totally inclusive.

- **Apprehension Rate** — this measure relates to apprehension activities of police units and the relation of apprehensions to complaints. One possible use in command and control or tactical deployment programs is to measure the success in apprehending suspects during the commission of a target crime.

- **Arrest/Conviction Rate** — a rate designed to measure the number of arrests resulting in convictions. If one can reasonably exclude prosecutor discretion and other reasons for failure to prosecute or obtain convictions, the rate can be used as one measure of police investigative effectiveness.

- **Attitudinal Index** — the major purpose of this index is to measure the attitudes of individuals who are participating in preventive programs such as multi-media crime prevention, youth services, adult/juvenile diversion projects, and delinquency prevention. Attitudinal indices are expected to be useful for measuring the effects of many programs within the four major criminal justice areas.

- **Case Load** — the number of cases handled by probation, parole, or police officers can be indicative of the efficiency of these individuals and the system in the performance of program duties.

- **Court Delay Time** — this measure can be used to assess the efficiency or timeliness with which the adjudication process is carried out. This measure will be useful for such programs as automated court calendaring, case management and various other court programs.

- **Response Time** — this is a generally accepted measure for assessing the efficiency of command and control programs and deployment of tactical police units.

- **Clearance Rate** — this rate is designed to measure the fraction of crimes reported to the police which have been closed by means of arrest of the offender, the offender’s death, or other conclusive dispositions. It can be indicative of police detection and apprehension programs.

- **Cost/Benefit Ratio** — this ratio indicates the relationship between the expenditure of resources on program activities and the results achieved. It can be used in a variety of situations especially where different approaches to common goals are to be compared.

- **Crime-Seriousness Index** — this measure is designed to reflect the relative seriousness of crime within a given area and can be applied to various programs within each of the four criminal justice functional areas. Several variations of this index can be developed, e.g., seriousness of crime can be based upon cost to the community or effect on victims in terms of value of property stolen, days lost due to injuries, etc. One example of constructing a crime-seriousness index is to assign relative weights to the types of crimes committed. These weights are then multiplied by the number of crimes falling within each category, and the resultant numbers are then totaled to reflect one measure of crime-seriousness.

- **Drug Abuse Rate** — this rate can be used to measure the number of addicts per unit of population. It can be useful in evaluation of various drug abuse programs such as community education programs designed to curb the use of dangerous drugs among the population at large.
- **Parole/Probation Failure Rate** — this measure will be used to indicate the effectiveness of parole or probationary type programs aimed at reintegrating the offender into society. It is normally based on the number of rearrests of persons on or released from probation or parole.

- **Project/Program Dropout Rate** — the purpose of this rate is to measure the effectiveness of rehabilitative type programs aimed at the motivational characteristics of its participants.

- **Stolen Property Recovered** — the monetary value of stolen property recovered can be used as a measure related to police detection activities and community action programs such as the Computer Identification Project.

- **Truancy/School Dropout Rates** — these measures are indicative of the success of preventive programs in changing the attitudes of juveniles. They relate to programs such as family intervention, community centers, treatment of disruptive children, and coordination of juvenile activities.

- **Recidivism Rate** — this measure (often expressed as the percent arrested for one crime who are later rearrested for a comparable crime) is designed to assess the effectiveness of rehabilitative programs in dissuading Impact crime offenders from returning to crime.

- **Rehabilitation Index** — this index can be used to measure the degree of success of a rehabilitation program in terms of the enrollee’s response to program activities, such as education, training, counseling, and job placement. As an index, this measure can be sub-defined in terms of its components; each component can further be assigned a relative value, based upon the participant’s performance.

- **Rate of Violation of Conditional Release** — this measure indicates the degree of success of various programs involving non-detention defendants awaiting trial, such as release on one’s own recognizance (ROR), probation, bail reform and pretrial diversion.

### C. EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING

1. **Preparing Project Evaluation Components**

   The responsibility for preparing the project grant application, including the evaluation component, rests directly with the implementing agency. The designation of the project director rests with the implementing agency subject to approval of the Texas Criminal Justice Council when appropriate. Evaluation will be on-going throughout the life of the grant and the level of quality with which the evaluation components are developed will be of major significance in determining the strength of the entire evaluation and data systems. Therefore, a close coordination will be of utmost importance during the process of planning and development of the project grant applications.

2. **Reviewing Evaluation Components as Applications are Received**

   To fulfill each level of responsibility in the evaluations, the project grant application, including the evaluation component, will be reviewed from the different perspectives of the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council and the Texas Criminal Justice Council.

3. **Establishing a Reporting Format**

   The information necessary to evaluate annual action projects will be described in the evaluation component within each project grant application. Upon grant approval by the Texas Criminal Justice Council, this information will be transcribed to a report form by the DACJC evaluation staff in order to provide a framework for the reporting of the necessary evaluation data. This form must be agreeable to the project director, the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council, and the Texas Criminal Justice Council.
D. IMPACT PROGRAM EVALUATION

Impact projects will be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines printed in the *Dallas High Impact Anti-Crime Program — 1973 Evaluation Plan* approved by the Texas Criminal Justice Council in fiscal year 1973. Throughout the Impact Program, the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council will continue to measure the effectiveness and performance of all Impact projects.
VI. DALLAS AREA ACTION PROJECTS
The 1974 Dallas Area Criminal Justice Plan outlines the need for the expenditure of $5,643,726 in 1974 criminal justice funds. These needs are based upon an analysis of crime trends and rates in Dallas County and represent a projection of fiscal resources which, if systematically applied, will aid the Dallas criminal justice system in maintaining its crime reduction efforts.

The planning program is organized and has been implemented in accordance with the guidelines prepared by the Texas Criminal Justice Council and, therefore, represents a program for specific crime reduction in Dallas County. Each project represents an integral part of an overall crime reduction program. In preparing the plan, a strict set of criteria was used in an effort to assure that the crime oriented nature of the plan was maintained and its purposes were realized. Therefore, some projects originally suggested have been deleted from the final plan, others have been combined, and project budgets have been reduced to avoid the “shopping list” approach to requests for funding. Indicative of this is the fact that the plan projects the implementation of 44 projects, which is considerably less than the 78 which were presented in the 1973 plan. Notices of Intent have been requested and received for all projects submitted and, therefore, represent a commitment by local government to implement the projects which are presented in the plan. No project appears in the plan without this commitment.

During the current year, Dallas and Dallas County have experienced a turnaround in the crime trends which were evident in the decade of the sixties. Significant accomplishments have been realized in reducing the spiraling crime rates and in fact a reduction has occurred. This effort must be maintained, strengthened, and carried forward. The Dallas Area Criminal Justice Plan represents the programs designed for 1974 to maintain this crime reduction effort.

The Dallas Area has an unparalleled opportunity, especially when considered in relation to the thrust of past accomplishments. The responsibility, however, rests not only with Dallas but also with those who have assisted in the past. The Dallas area criminal justice system is committed to the successful implementation of this program. This commitment should be shared by the Texas Criminal Justice Council in funding this program.

Justification for funding of the requests in this program can also be measured in terms of the crime rate in Dallas when compared to other major cities in Texas and the state as a whole. The following charts emphasize that Dallas experiences an Index crime problem equal to or greater than any other metropolitan area in Texas.

### Comparison of 1971 Index Crime Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>5,495.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>4,771.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>4,082.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>3,544.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,697.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department  
P.B.I. Uniform Crime Report
### 1971 Index Crime Rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Aggravated Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Over $50</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>338.8</td>
<td>625.5</td>
<td>2,169.8</td>
<td>1,448.2</td>
<td>818.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>415.8</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>2,126.7</td>
<td>891.7</td>
<td>1,035.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>319.6</td>
<td>1,681.1</td>
<td>1,224.1</td>
<td>733.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>1,617.2</td>
<td>715.6</td>
<td>727.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>1,175.0</td>
<td>781.2</td>
<td>367.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dallas Police Department

Although significant accomplishments have been made, approximately 19 percent of all 1972 Index crime in Texas occurred in Dallas. This plan represents needs which, if funded, would require approximately 16 percent of the Texas criminal justice budget. When compared to the problems of crime and delinquency in Dallas, this request seems reasonable.

The 1970 Census reports Dallas County has a current population of 1,327,321. This represents an increase of 39.5 percent during the past ten years. Dallas County’s population is 12 percent of the total population of the State of Texas. With only 12 percent of the total statewide population, the crime rates in Dallas, when compared to other major cities in Texas and the state as a whole, are even more significant. This crime rate is also significant in that the Texas Department of Corrections receives approximately 20 percent of its inmate population from the Dallas County criminal justice system — a population which is greater than the total population in 27 of the state penal institutions in the United States.

During 1973 only eleven new projects have been funded out of a total of 78 which were presented in the 1972 plan. This pattern of funding is small in comparison to the problems of crime and delinquency in Dallas. The 1974 plan projects 44 projects, representing a total cost of $5,643,726. The Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council and the respective applicants are committed to the implementation of these projects. The problems of crime and delinquency in Dallas justify funding of the crime reduction program presented in this plan.
## CONTINUATION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Request Amount</th>
<th>Year of CJC Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 73-A-2</td>
<td>Educational Incentive for Dallas Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 73-B-1</td>
<td>Mesquite Police/Community Services Program</td>
<td>38,760.00</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 73-B-1</td>
<td>Crime Prevention — Education Unit (Garland)</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 73-C-7</td>
<td>Rotary Town House (Dallas County)</td>
<td>37,839.00</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 73-D-3</td>
<td>Legal Assistance to Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>21,250.00</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 73-E-1</td>
<td>Administrative and Legal Support to Dallas County Criminal District and County Criminal Courts</td>
<td>346,375.00</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 73-E-2</td>
<td>Creation of Specialized Crime Division (District Attorney)</td>
<td>255,000.00</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 73-F-1</td>
<td>In-Service Training and Education Program (Dallas County)</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 73-F-3</td>
<td>Dallas County Jail Library Program</td>
<td>4,575.00</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 73-F-3</td>
<td>Educational Rehabilitation for Dallas County Inmates</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 73-J-5</td>
<td>Regional Communications Control Equipment and Services (Dallas County)</td>
<td>213,000.00</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$1,071,799.00
UTILIZATION SHEET

4. Program title: Professional College Education
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Sheriff's Office
6. Project title: Educational Incentive for Dallas Sheriff's Office
7. Date project to start: December 1, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: September 1, 1974
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $25,000 50%
   b. Local cash $25,000 50%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $50,000 100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: First-year funding will be requested late 1973.
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This program will provide educational incentive pay for 70 law officers in the Sheriff's Office who have completed at least one year of accredited law enforcement education. The program will lead to more stable employment and more efficient operation of the Dallas County Sheriff's Office.
   b. Project life: This program will raise the professional level of performance, which will reduce the incidence of major crimes in Dallas County. Turnover of deputies should decrease by 20% in three years.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-1  2. Priority Cont.  3. Program Number B1


5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite — Mesquite Police Department

6. Project title: Mesquite Police — Community Services Program

7. Date project to start: November 15, 1973

8. Date application to be submitted: August 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state)  $38,760  77%
   b. Local cash  $11,510  23%
   c. Local in-kind
   d. Total  $50,270  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: 2-B3-1331

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
    None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: (1) To reach 90% of all businesses and 50% of all residences with a theft prevention program. (2) To reach 100% of the area schools with a drug abuse program.
   b. Project life: Project to be continued through City of Mesquite budget after funding ends.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-1  
2. Priority Cont.  
3. Program Number B1  
4. Program title: Special Units and Programs  
5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland  
6. Project title: Crime Prevention — Education Unit  
7. Date project to start: January 15, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: September 15, 1973  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $35,000 85%  
   b. Local cash $2,000 5%  
   c. Local in-kind $4,180 10%  
   d. Total $41,180 100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: AC-3-B1-1397  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year:  
      1. Improved community awareness to crime problems.  
      2. Increase Garland Police Department crime clearance rate from 43% to 60% for two-year period.  
      3. Reduce number of burglaries and thefts over $50 by 20% over two-year period.  
   b. Project life: (See 14a)  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

2. Priority Cont.  
3. Program Number: C7

4. Program title: Juvenile Interim Homes

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County

6. Project title: Rotary Town House

7. Date project to start: March 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: January 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state): $37,839  
      75%
   b. Local cash: $  
      %
   c. Local in-kind: $12,613  
      25%
   d. Total: $50,452  
      100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: 72-C8-820

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
    None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Continue community involvement in services to delinquents through sponsorship of the Downtown Rotary Club of Dallas. The project cushions the transition from institutional life to community life for delinquent juveniles. It provides a dwelling for ten boys with the support of the Dallas County Boys Home.
   b. Project life: Providing of educational/vocational training and other rehabilitative opportunities to approximately 24 boys over a three-year period.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET


4. Program title: Professional Aides for Police

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff's Office

6. Project title: Provide Legal Assistance to Sheriff's Office

7. Date project to start: March 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: January 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal and state) $21,250  85%
   b. Local cash $ 3,750  15%
   c. Local in-kind $ %
   d. Total $25,000  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: Initial funding will be requested in late 1973.

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: To provide legal advice during case preparation so as to improve the quality of prosecution, both at the scene of the offense and in collection of evidence. (1) Assist arresting officers in the preparation of detailed offense reports, more accurate case records. (2) Provide legal assistance to Sheriff and training for Sheriff's deputies in such areas as evidence collection and preservation, rights of individuals, etc. (3) Provide liaison to other fields of law enforcement, especially the Dallas Police Department and Dallas Criminalistics Laboratory.
   b. Project life: Same as above.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority Cont.  
3. Program Number E1

4. Program title: Courts Aides and Assistance

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County

6. Project title: Administrative and Legal Support to Dallas County Criminal District and County Criminal Courts

7. Date project to start: September 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: June 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $346,375 85%
   b. Local cash
   c. Local in-kind $ 61,125 15%
   d. Total $407,500 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: 2-E1-1197

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
   None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: The program will continue to enable the Judges to devote more time to hearing criminal cases and to related court matters, thus reducing case backlogs and the time between indictment and trial.
   b. Project life: A much greater efficiency in court administration will be effected during the life of the project. With judges free to devote their full time to court matters, the number of case dispositions per court should increase by 30%.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  2. Priority Cont.  3. Program Number E2, E4

4. Program title: Prosecutor Aides and Assistance

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County District Attorney's Office

6. Project title: Creation of Specialized Crime Division

7. Date project to start: December 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: September 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $255,000 85%
   b. Local cash $ 5,000 2%
   c. Local in-kind $ 40,000 13%
   d. Total $300,000 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: Application for first-year funding to be submitted 9/73.

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Second-year funding will be required to pay salaries of additional personnel added by this re-organization and expansion in the District Attorneys' Office. Projects supported by this grant include purchase of storage equipment for Records and Commercial Fraud Sections, mobile radio equipment investigator/prosecutor alert system, and library volumes, in addition to the creation of the Specialized Crime Division (includes Commercial Fraud, Hot Check, Organized Crime and Complaint Sections).

   b. Project life: This project is designed to effect a more efficient operation in the District Attorney's Office and improve the quality of prosecution of consumer and commercial fraud cases, thus enabling the reduction of the time from arrest to trial of such cases by 10%.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal IV-1  
2. Priority Cont.  
3. Program Number F1  
4. Program title: Correctional Personnel Training and Education  
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff's Office  
6. Project title: In-Service Training and Education Program  
7. Date project to start: December 1, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: September 1, 1974  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $50,000 85%  
   b. Local cash $  
   c. Local in-kind $ 8,824 15%  
   d. Total $58,824 100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: Initial funding will be requested in late 1973.  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Second-year funding of this program will cover the costs involved in using the services of professional instructors not in the employee of the jail, and in furnishing supplies for this in-house program. Upgrading the training and educational level of correctional personnel increases the effectiveness of correctional and rehabilitational programs and decreases the rate of recidivism.  
   b. Project life: During the life of this project, a decrease of 5% in the number of repeat offenders is expected due to the improved rehabilitative measures employed by better trained corrections personnel.  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in 43 and 44 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal II-2  
2. Priority Cont.  
3. Program Number F3  
4. Program title: Rehabilitation - Reintegration  
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff's Office  
6. Project title: Rehabilitative Library Program - Dallas County Jail  
7. Date project to start: September 1, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: June 1, 1974  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $4,575  75%  
   b. Local cash $  %  
   c. Local in-kind $1,525  25%  
   d. Total $6,100  100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: Initial funding will be requested in July, 1973.  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: During the second year of this program, funds will be used to purchase "maintenance" volumes for the "core collection" of the jail library and to purchase other rehabilitative materials related to this project.  
   b. Project life: It is anticipated that increased rehabilitative efforts of the jail librarian through this library project will contribute to behavioral modifications of offenders, resulting in a decrease in the number of repeat offenders.  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal II-2  2. Priority Cont.  3. Program Number F3

4. Program title: Rehabilitation - Reintegration Program

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County

6. Project title: Educational Rehabilitation for Dallas County Jail Inmates

7. Date project to start: September 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: June 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state)  $45,000  75%
   b. Local cash  $ 3,000  5%
   c. Local in-kind  $12,000  20%
   d. Total  $60,000  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: 2-F3-1350

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
   None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This program enables 300 short-term inmates to enroll in college level non-credit courses (or guided studies for college preparation) for the project-life period. Inmates receive SCAT pre-testing so that evaluation of their educational needs is accurate. Upon release an inmate may take, at his own expense, SCAT or “challenge” exams to earn credit for the courses he has taken, better preparing him both for employment and/or continued education.

   b. Project life: Same as above.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority Cont.  
3. Program Number J5  

4. Program title: Landline Communications  

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Auditor's Office  

6. Project title: Regional Communications Control Equipment and Services  

7. Date project to start: March 1, 1974  

8. Date application to be submitted: December 1, 1973  

9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $213,000 83%  
   b. Local cash $20,000 8%  
   c. Local in-kind $25,000 9%  
   d. Total $258,000 100%  

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  

11. This project does continue as an existing project.  

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: AC-3-J5-1535  

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None  

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This project will continue the operation and development of an improved law enforcement communication network. The control system funded in this project provides message switching capabilities between law enforcement agencies throughout North Central Texas.  
   b. Project life: Total Regional Justice Information Systems usage by all authorized agencies will be effected. Total communication processing time will be reduced and communications expedited between local, regional, state, and national law enforcement agencies.  

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal I and the First Priority Goal.

The first priority crime-oriented goal is: Reduce crimes against property by 15% in one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Systems Integration</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Dallas County Law Enforcement Assistance System</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Special Investigative Unit — Major Case Unit</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Major Crime Monitoring Unit</td>
<td>$337,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Pleasure Vehicle Identification Handbook</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Establish a “Police Reporter Unit” in Grand Prairie Police Department</td>
<td>$31,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Special Tactical Unit — Selective Enforcement</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Portable Crime Sensing — Burglary Detection System</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Development and Implementation of Police Information System Improvements</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Fast Apprehension of a Lawbreaker by a Copter at Night</td>
<td>$27,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Identification of Recovered Stolen Property</td>
<td>$18,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police Management Study</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Impounded Motor Vehicle Inspection Unit</td>
<td>$123,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Crime Scene Search Equipment</td>
<td>$12,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $2,906,312
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal 1-1 2. Priority 1 3. Program Number J1

4. Program title: Improvement of Communications and Information Systems

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department

6. Project title: Systems Integration

7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $1,200,000 85%
   b. Local cash $211,765 15%
   c. Local in-kind $% 0%
   d. Total $1,411,765 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Reduction of property offenses as a result of an improved information and communication capability through: (1) reduction in access time (2) enhanced information availability (3) increased agency access and (4) more effective message exchange at all criminal justice system levels.
   b. Project life: Improved information dissemination on a regional basis, allowing increased apprehension of burglars and prevention of property offenses through: (1) improved police response time, and (2) expanded data collection and analysis for effective tactical deployment.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.

VI-17

4. Program title: Information Systems

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County

6. Project title: Dallas County Law Enforcement Assistance System

7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $850,000 85%
   b. Local cash $ %
   c. Local in-kind $150,000 15%
   d. Total $1,000,000 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Develop and schedule implementation of:
      (1) Offense Tracking and Reporting System
      (2) Evidence Inventory System
      (3) MO and Personal Characteristics System
   b. Project life: The above systems will be established over a three-year period.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal I-1  
2. Priority 3  
3. Program Number D5  
4. Program title: Special Units and Programs  
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff's Office  
6. Project title: Special Investigative Unit - Major Case Unit  
7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $85,000 85%  
   b. Local cash $  
   c. Local in-kind $15,000 15%  
   d. Total $100,000 100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: During the first year, two 2-man squads will be formed, trained and equipped. They will, led by a supervisor, investigate major crimes which occur throughout the county — particularly in regions where the municipalities have limited investigative facilities and personnel. Their specialized training and skills will provide supplementary assistance to the law enforcement units throughout the county, thereby increasing the rate of apprehension and the number of major crimes solved.  
   b. Project life: Over the project life period, two more 2-man squads will be added so that the final unit strength would be 8 men and 1 supervisor. Expansion in the second and third years will be on the basis of one new squad per year.  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.

4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department

6. Project title: Major Crime Monitoring Unit

7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state)  $337,137  85%
   b. Local cash  
   c. Local in-kind  $54,495  15%
   d. Total  $396,632  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Through surveillance of active criminals, leading to increased in-the-act arrests, greater prosecution potential and subsequent reduction of burglaries and other Index offenses committed by these offenders.
   b. Project life: The project will support an enhanced intelligence posture, leading not only to arrests of offenders themselves, but improved information about criminal associates and their activities, leading to a greater impact on Index offense rates and subsequent prosecution.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal 1-2
2. Priority 5
3. Program Number A4
4. Program title: Upgrading Law Enforcement Personnel
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department
7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $35,000 85%
   b. Local cash $ 0%
   c. Local in-kind $ 6,176 15%
   d. Total $41,176 100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 0
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Increased identification of stolen boats, motors, trailers, and motorcycles and a greater rate of recovery in the North Central Texas Region is anticipated by the implementation of a handbook to guide law enforcement officers in such identification.
   b. Project life: Implementation of this project will lead to increases in identification and conviction of offenders with a reduction of thefts involving boats, motors, trailers, and motorcycles, combined with a greater amount of recovered vehicles and/or equipment of this kind.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTII.IZA
ON
SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal I-1
2. Priority 6
3. Program Number D5

4. Program title: Special Units and Programs

5. Proposed applicant: City of Grand Prairie

6. Project title: Establish a "Police Reporter Unit" in Grand Prairie Police Department

7. Date project to start: October 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: August, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $31,705 85%
   b. Local cash $ 5,595 15%
   c. Local in-kind $%
   d. Total $37,300 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Provide female police reporters to handle 800 routine calls and investigations during the first year. Provide increased police presence in high burglary incidence areas to increase on-view arrests by 2% during the first year, Inform 250 residences and 75 businesses of effective burglary prevention techniques during the first year.
   b. Project life: Continuing

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-1  
2. Priority 7  
3. Program Number D5

4. Program title: Special Units and Programs

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland

6. Project title: Special Tactical Unit - Selective Enforcement

7. Date project to start: January 30, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: September 30, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $107,000 85%
   b. Local cash $10,000 8%
   c. Local in-kind $8,882 7%
   d. Total $125,882 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: 

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Increase Garland Police Department's overall crime clearance rate by 7%.
   b. Project life: Increase Garland Police Department's overall crime clearance rate by 18%.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.

4. Program title: Technical Improvements

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland


7. Date project to start: February 15, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: October 15, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $22,000 85%
   b. Local cash $1,500 6%
   c. Local in-kind $2,385 9%
   d. Total $25,885 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
   None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Reduce burglary by 5%.
   b. Project life: Same

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-1  
2. Priority 9  
3. Program Number J2  

4. Program title: Technological Improvements  

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland  

6. Project title: Development and Implementation of Police Information System Improvements  

7. Date project to start: April 30, 1974  

8. Date application to be submitted: December 30, 1973  

9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) \( $40,000 \) 85%  
   b. Local cash \( $3,000 \) 6%  
   c. Local in-kind \( $4,060 \) 9%  
   d. Total \( $47,060 \) 100%  

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):  
   None  

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Improve police response time 10%. Speed up general administrative processing time by 10%. Rapid access to current police data.  
   b. Project life: Same as above  

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal: I-1
2. Priority: 10
3. Program Number: B3

4. Program title: Special Meritorious Project

5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite - Police Department

6. Project title: Fast Apprehension of a Lawbreaker by a Copter at Night (FALCON)

7. Date project to start: March 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: December 15, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $27,230 85%
   b. Local cash $4,806 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $32,036 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has not been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: To reduce police response time from ten minutes to three minutes.
   b. Project life: Second year continuation. Continuation of project through City of Mesquite budget when funding ends.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-1
2. Priority 11
3. Program Number D5

4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department

6. Project title: Identification of Recovered Stolen Property

7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $18,136 85%
   b. Local cash $ %
   c. Local in-kind $ 3,200 15%
   d. Total $21,336 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: The utilization of experienced police personnel to
      examine recovered stolen property will permit increased application of scientific methods,
      increased offender identification, enhanced prosecution, return of such property, and
      improved investigator support.
   b. Project life: Implementation of this project will result in an improved ability to identify
      all incoming stolen property, meaning establishment of relationship between property
      and suspected offender, offense reduction through more certain prosecution, and increased
      return of property to owners.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4
    above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to
    years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal I-1  2. Priority 12  3. Program Number D1

4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals

5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite

6. Project title: Law Enforcement Management Study

7. Date project to start: August 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: May 15, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $17,000 85%
   b. Local cash $3,000 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $20,000 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
   None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Results of the study will include recommendations for implementation concerning the organization of the department, the effectiveness of its programs, and a suggested plan for growth. Emphasis will be given to achieving the City's multi-year goal of reducing Index crimes by 20% in five years.
   b. Project life:

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.

VI-28
UTLILIZATION SHEET


4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department

6. Project title: Impounded Motor Vehicle Inspection Unit

7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $123,354 85%
   b. Local cash
   c. Local in-kind $21,768 15%
   d. Total $145,122 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: (1) Increase in identification of stolen vehicles through improved inspection of those motor vehicles which have been impounded. (2) Increase in identification of auto thieves.
   b. Project life: Through improved identification of auto thieves, an increase in the prosecution and conviction of these offenders is expected, ultimately causing a reduction in the number of automobile thefts committed.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
4. Program title: Technical Improvements
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff's Office
6. Project title: Crime Scene Search Equipment
7. Date project to start: March 1, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: December 1, 1973
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $12,750 85%
   b. Local cash $2,250 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $15,000 100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This project would provide the Dallas County Sheriff's Office with fingerprint, photographic, and other such equipment enabling officers to catalogue in a systematic and scientific manner evidence that is vital to prosecution. Delivery of said evidence (in a usable state) to the Forensic Lab would be accomplished by use of this crime scene equipment.
   b. Project life: Over the project life, it is expected that use of such equipment will increase apprehension of offenders by 10%.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal I and the Second Priority Goal.

The second priority crime-oriented goal is: Reduce Index crimes by 10% in one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Bomb Disposal Unit</td>
<td>$72,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J4</td>
<td>Records Retrieval System for Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>$191,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Handie-Talkie Receiver Project</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J4</td>
<td>Fingerprint and Mug Shot Search and Retrieval System</td>
<td>$41,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Police Research and Planning Office</td>
<td>$10,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Police Cadet Program</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Implementation-Career Development Program</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Prosecution Aide/Legal Assistance</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Expanded Law Enforcement Capabilities through Technical Equipment Improvements</td>
<td>$23,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Implementation of Management and Organizational Improvements</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Police-Legal Advisor</td>
<td>$23,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$527,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  2. Priority 1  3. Program Number H1

4. Program title: Planning, Training, and Equipment

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff's Office

6. Project title: Bomb Disposal Unit

7. Date project to start: June 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: March 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state)  $72,250  85%
   b. Local cash  $12,750  15%
   c. Local in-kind
   d. Total  $85,000  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Increase the ability of the Sheriff’s Office to respond to an increasing number of bomb threats throughout the county by the addition of three technicians and related equipment such as a bomb disposal truck and trailer.
   b. Project life: Improve the capability of the Sheriff’s Office to detect, transfer, and disarm explosive devices and track these devices to their source.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.


5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff’s Office

6. Project title: Records Retrieval System for Sheriff’s Office

7. Date project to start: April 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: December 30, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justic Council (federal & state)   $191,250   85%
   b. Local cash    $ 33,750     15%
   c. Local in-kind
   d. Total         $225,000   100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This project will provide a microfilming storage and computerized records retrieval system for the Dallas County Sheriff’s Office. 200,000 records will be microfilmed, relieving the over-crowded condition of the Sheriff’s Office to some extent and providing for the rapid retrieval of these records.
   b. Project life: Same as above.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department
6. Project title: Handie-Talkie Receiver Project
7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $16,800  85%
   b. Local cash $  %
   c. Local in-kind $ 2,965  15%
   d. Total $19,765  100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
   a. None
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: (1) Reduce response time to less than 5 minutes on all calls for service. (2) Eliminate reception and transmission difficulties in areas where Handie-Talkies are not effective at this time.
   b. Project life: Implementation of this project will result in increased effectiveness among field units through improved communication, thereby increasing apprehension of criminals.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
2. Priority: 4
3. Program Number: J4
4. Program title: Improvement of Communications and Information System
5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite Police Department
6. Project title: Fingerprint and Mug Shot Search and Retrieval System
7. Date project to start: December, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: September 1, 1974
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $41,650 85%
   b. Local cash $7,350 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $49,000 100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has not been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: (1) Identification within 10 minutes of known drug users. Special emphasis on potential offenders. (2) Identification of burglary suspects within 10 minutes and suspect determination provided within one day if victim has general description of offender.
   b. Project life: Two years with funding assistance, thereafter, continued funding through the City of Mesquite budget.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority 5  
3. Program Number D3  

4. Program title: Professional Aides for Police  

5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite Police Department  

6. Project title: Police Research and Planning Office  

7. Date project to start: October 1, 1974  

8. Date application to be submitted: July 1, 1974  

9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $10,455 85%  
   b. Local cash $ 1,845  15%  
   c. Local in-kind $  85%  
   d. Total $12,300 100%  

10. A notification of intent to apply has not been submitted.  

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1  

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: (1) To increase clearance rate for burglaries by 25%  
      (2) To increase drug arrests to 10%  
      (3) To reduce theft by 2% the first year and by 5% the second and increase the clearance rate by 10% the first year.  
   b. Project life: Second year continuation. Continuation of project through City of Mesquite budget when funding ends.  

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2
2. Priority 6
3. Program Number A2

4. Program title: Professional College Education

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland

6. Project title: Police Cadet Program

7. Date project to start: September 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: June 30, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $48,000 85%
   b. Local cash $3,000 5%
   c. Local in-kind $5,470 10%
   d. Total $56,470 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
   $48,000
   $3,000
   $5,470
   $56,470
   85%
   5%
   10%
   100%

13. Anticipated number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Initiate training of 12 police cadets for future departmental needs.
   b. Project life: Continue training and experience for cadet officers and possible expand program during second and third years.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal 1-2  
2. Priority 7  
3. Program Number A3

4. Program title: Personnel Administration Systems

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland

6. Project title: Implementation-Career Development Program

7. Date project to start: August 30, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: May 30, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $38,000 85%
   b. Local cash $2,000 5%
   c. Local in-kind $4,705 10%
   d. Total $44,705 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
   None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year:
      - Reduce personnel turnover.
      - Improve morale among police officers.
      - Help maintain quality police force.
   b. Project life: Same as above.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority 8  
3. Program Number D3  
4. Program title: Prosecutors Aides and Assistance  
5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland  
6. Project title: Prosecution Aide/Legal Assistance  
7. Date project to start: June 30, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: March 30, 1974  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $30,000 85%  
   b. Local cash $2,000 6%  
   c. Local in-kind $3,295 9%  
   d. Total $35,295 100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Increase number of cases in which convictions are obtained by 10%. Achieve greater efficiency in administrative operations involving Garland Police and courts.  
   b. Project life: Increase number of cases in which convictions are obtained by 20%.  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority 9  
3. Program Number D4

4. Program title: Technical Improvements

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland

6. Project title: Expanded Law Enforcement Capabilities through Technical Equipment Improvements

7. Date project to start: May 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: February 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $23,545  85%
   b. Local cash $4,155  15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $27,700  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year:
      Reduce Index Crimes by 5%.
      Improve overall departmental capability.
   b. Project life: Same as above.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority 10  
3. Program Number D1

4. Program title: Management Analysis

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland

6. Project title: Implementation of Management and Organizational Improvements

7. Date project to start: June 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: March 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $32,000  85%
   b. Local cash $ 1,500  4%
   c. Local in-kind $ 4,150  11%
   d. Total $37,650  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974):
    None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year:
      Improve police response times 10%.
      Improve overall clearance rates 7%.
      Improve departmental efficiency and effectiveness.
   b. Project life: Same as above.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal I-2  
2. Priority 11  
3. Program Number D3  

4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals  

5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite Police Department  

6. Project title: Police - Legal Advisor  

7. Date project to start: November 1, 1974  

8. Date application to be submitted: August 1, 1974  

9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $23,624 85%  
   b. Local cash $ 4,169 15%  
   c. Local in-kind $  
   d. Total $27,793 100%  

10. A notification of intent to apply has not been submitted.  

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1  

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: To reduce the Dallas County Grand Jury's "No Bill" action in theft offenses from 27% to 15% and reduce the dismissals after indictment from 10% to 5%.  
   b. Project life: Continued funding through City of Mesquite budget after project ends.  

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal II and the First Priority Goal.

The first priority crime-oriented goal is: Reduce Index crimes committed by repeat offenders by 20% in one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Revision and Expansion of the Juvenile Section</td>
<td>$63,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UTILIZATION SHEET


4. Program title: Prosecutor Aides and Assistance

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County District Attorney's Office

6. Project title: Revision and Expansion of the Juvenile Section

7. Date project to start: April 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: January 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $63,750 85%
   b. Local cash $
   c. Local in-kind $11,250 15%
   d. Total $75,000 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Initial funding will provide two attorneys and two investigators for the newly combined Child Support-Juvenile Section, increasing the number of cases handled in this section and shortening the time of disposition of such.
   b. Project life: During the project life, the District Attorney's office Juvenile Section, will develop and expand its capacity to handle the anticipated case load resulting from accelerated police activities. Disposition time is expected to decrease by 20% during the life of the project.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal II and the Second Priority Goal.

The second priority crime-oriented goal is: Reduce misdemeanors by repeat offenders by 10% in one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Expansion of &quot;Style of Case Index&quot;</td>
<td>$26,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Judicial Information System for County Criminal Courts</td>
<td>70,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td>Improvements of Information and Communications Systems</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Alterations to Steelwork of Dallas County Jail</td>
<td>487,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$923,805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Crime oriented goal II-2  
2. Priority 1  
3. Program Number E1  
4. Program title: Courts Aides and Assistance  
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County  
6. Project title: Expansion of “Style of Case Index”  
7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $26,180 85%  
   b. Local cash $ 8%  
   c. Local in-kind $ 4,620 15%  
   d. Total $30,800 100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This “Style of Case Index” project provides an index of convicted misdemeanants enabling the courts to identify second offense DWI and other similar cases. The project was initiated by Dallas County using local funds. This request for funds will provide the necessary money to complete the project.  
   b. Project life: Same as above.  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal II-2  
2. Priority 2  
3. Program Number J1

4. Program title: Information Systems

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County

6. Project title: Judicial Information System for County Criminal Courts

7. Date project to start: July 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: April 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $70,125 85%
   b. Local cash $ %
   c. Local in-kind $12,375 15%
   d. Total $82,500 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number: $70,125 85%

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This program would supply two County Criminal Courts with statistical data relating to cases being tracked through the Criminal Justice System.
   b. Project life: Eventually all County Criminal Courts will be brought into the system, improving the overall information system for all the courts.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

4. Program title: Law Enforcement Radio Communications
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County
6. Project title: Improvement of Information and Communications Systems
7. Date project to start: Late 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: 90 days prior to start of project
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $340,000 85%
   b. Local cash $ 60,000 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $400,000 100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This program, to be developed by NCTCOG when the present regional communications study being conducted is completed, will provide master consoles, mobile radios and other communication equipment necessary to upgrade the inadequate system now in use.
   b. Project life: During the life of the project, congestion of frequencies will be eliminated and coordination between various agencies using like communication systems will be smoothly effected.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
4. Program title: Planning and Construction of New or Improved Correctional Facilities  
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County  
6. Project title: Alterations to Steelwork of Dallas County Jail  
7. Date project to start: April 1, 1974  
8. Date application to be submitted: January 1, 1974  
9. Anticipated funding:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This request for funding will enable Dallas County  
   b. Local cash  
      $62,500  
      9.6%  
   c. Local in-kind  
      $100,000  
      15.4%  
   d. Total  
      $650,000  
      100%  
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.  
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.  
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:  
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar  
    1974): None  
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:  
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This request for funding will enable Dallas County  
      to comply with Article 51-15 of Texas Civil Statutes.  
   b. Project life: Same as above.  
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4  
    above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years  
    of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal III and the First Priority Goal.

The first priority crime-oriented goal is: Reduce drug related crime activity by 30% in five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Canine Corps for Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>$ 8,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Establish Expanded Narcotics Squad in Grand Prairie</td>
<td>15,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Establish Special Youth Services Component</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Improve Police Photo-Lab Equipment and Capabilities</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$68,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Program title: Special Units and Programs

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas County Sheriff’s Office

6. Project title: Canine Corps for Sheriff’s Office

7. Date project to start: June 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: March 1, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $8,415  85%
   b. Local cash $  %
   c. Local in-kind $1,485  15%
   d. Total $9,900  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 2

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This program will increase detection and apprehension of offenders as well as assist in control of civil disorders by acquisition and training of six canines. The dogs will be especially useful in detecting the presence of narcotics and in finding hidden explosives.
   b. Project life: Increased apprehension of drug offenders is anticipated as well as speedy detection of hidden explosives.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.

4. Program title: Special Units and Programs

5. Proposed applicant: City of Grand Prairie

6. Project title: Establish Expanded Narcotics Squad in Grand Prairie

7. Date project to start: October 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: August, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $15,438 85%
   b. Local cash $ 2,724 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $18,162 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Produce drug abuse programs for presentation to 15 elementary, 4 Junior High and 2 Senior High Schools in Grand Prairie during the first year. Increase drug abuse detection and apprehension capability by 6% in one year:
   b. Project life: Continuing and to be assumed fully by local funding beginning with third and consecutive years.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
1. Crime-oriented goal III-1  
2. Priority 3  
3. Program Number B3

4. Program title: Special Meritorious Projects

5. Proposed applicant: City of Garland

6. Project title: Establish Special Youth Services Component

7. Date project to start: March 15, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 15, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $28,000 85%
   b. Local cash $ 2,000 6%
   c. Local in-kind $ 2,945 9%
   d. Total $32,945 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: Reduce crimes of theft by 5%.
   b. Project life: Reduce crimes of theft by 10% in two years.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET


4. Program title: Improvement of Detection and Apprehension of Criminals

5. Proposed applicant: City of Mesquite Police Department

6. Project title: Improve Police Photo-Lab Equipment and Capabilities

7. Date project to start: November - December, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: August, 1974

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $17,000  85%
   b. Local cash $3,000  15%
   c. Local in-kind
   d. Total $20,000  100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has not been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: To provide increased mug-shot capabilities from the present 60% to 90%. To provide color photos of suspect and of suspect and victim for reliable identification by trained photo-lab technician.
   b. Project life: One year. Continued through the City of Mesquite budget.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal III and the Second Priority Goal

The second priority crime-oriented goal is: Reduce the incidence of organized crime activity by 10% in one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td>Public Awareness of Organized Crime</td>
<td>$46,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Crime-oriented goal III-2
2. Priority 1
3. Program Number G6
4. Program title: Reduction of Organized Crime
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department
6. Project title: Public Awareness of Organized Crime
7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $46,410 85%
   b. Local cash $8,190 15%
   c. Local in-kind $
   d. Total $54,600 100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): 1
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: To educate the public in the recognition, existence, and awareness of organized crime through the use of 104-30-Sec. spots on local T.V. stations supplemented by ¼-page local newspaper ads.
   b. Project life: The intelligence capability of the Police Department in reference to organized crime will be increased by the enhancement of public input leading to apprehension and prosecution.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
Projects to Support Multi-year Goal IV and the First Priority Goal.

The first priority crime-oriented goal is: Strengthen Dallas Police Department community relations to the extent that no major civil disorder occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Firearms Judgement and Recognition Training</td>
<td>$29,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Police Administrators Advanced Management Workshop</td>
<td>$6,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$35,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Program title: Upgrading Law Enforcement Personnel
5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department
6. Project title: Firearms Judgement and Recognition Training
7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974
8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973
9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $29,144  85%
   b. Local cash $   %
   c. Local in-kind $ 5,142  15%
   d. Total $34,286  100%
10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.
11. This project does not continue as an existing project.
12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:
13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None
14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: The result will be a decrease in improper use of firearms resulting in increased rapport with general public and reduction in manpower loss due to injuries sustained or suspensions from duty. Acquisition of materials and equipment will enable the Department to provide continuous in-service training.
   b. Project life: This project will result in better evaluation of a hazardous situation, proper identification of a target, and improved firearms skill. Community relations will be promoted through the resulting upgrade in personnel capabilities and an improved police image.
15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
UTILIZATION SHEET

1. Crime-oriented goal IV-1  
2. Priority 2  
3. Program Number A1

4. Program title: Upgrading Law Enforcement Personnel

5. Proposed applicant: Dallas Police Department

6. Project title: Police Administrators Advanced Management Workshop

7. Date project to start: February 1, 1974

8. Date application to be submitted: November 1, 1973

9. Anticipated funding:
   a. Criminal Justice Council (federal & state) $6,079 85%
   b. Local cash $ %
   c. Local in-kind $1,073 15%
   d. Total $7,152 100%

10. A notification of intent to apply has been submitted.

11. This project does not continue as an existing project.

12. If so, it is a continuation of project number:

13. Anticipate number of additional years funding will be needed (do not count calendar 1974): None

14. Anticipated accomplishments during:
   a. First (next, if continuation) year: This project will enhance the managerial competencies of 150 Dallas Police Department supervisors which in turn will increase the operational efficiency of the Department, thus impacting both directly and indirectly on the entire criminal justice system.
   b. Project life: This project will increase the efficiency of the Dallas Police Department, that is the overall efficiency of the Dallas Police Department will be improved by virtue of the managerial improvement of its supervisors and their increased ability to work as a team.

15. This proposed project fully conforms with the program description shown in #3 and #4 above as to eligibility and fully conforms with existing CJC and LEAA guidelines as to years of funding, minimum grant size, etc.
B. IMPACT PROJECTS
IMPACT CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 1.0
REDUCE BURGLARY IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 3% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Fence Control</td>
<td>$ 336,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Real-Time Tactical Deployment</td>
<td>35,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Expansion of Tactical Deployment</td>
<td>1,470,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 CATCH (Community Awareness to Criminal Habits)</td>
<td>722,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Crime Investigation Pilot Study</td>
<td>422,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,987,883</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPCAlCT PROJEC1.1

FENCE CONTROL

PROBLEM:

The investigation techniques employed by the Dallas Police Department during the three-year period, 1970-1972, against the 59,307 actual burglaries resulted in an average clearance rate of 19.34 percent of those offenses. While reported property loss total $16,922,229, the average recovery rate was 10.9 percent of that total. Thus, a total of $15,996,124 in stolen property was not recovered for this three-year period. The indication, thus, is that burglary has been and remains a profitable venture for the offender. Only a minimum of stolen property is being recovered. Much of this stolen property, other than cash, is frequently disposed of by the offender at business dealing in used merchandise—the primary source of the burglar's profit.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Initially check or inspect on a nearly routine basis some 279 businesses engaged in buying and selling used property. Assumption: That aggressive, consistent inspection of all possible outlets for stolen property is the key to discouraging receiving and concealing of stolen property.

2. Increase identification of all known sources of stolen property disposal by 10 percent. Assumption: That the best results achieved from this project will necessitate thorough investigation and intelligence in an effort to anticipate the offender's search for profit.

3. Increase recovery and identification of all stolen property by 10 percent and return to rightful owners. Assumption: A basic responsibility of the police is to restore the victim to his former status prior to the offense. This project must aim at enhancing this posture as a result of intensive investigation.

4. Locate, identify, and prosecute an additional 25 percent of receivers and concealers of stolen property. Assumption: The aim of reducing profit potential in Impact property crimes demands the elimination of both burglar and fence through effective investigation and case preparation in order to deter such activities.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Fence Control Project is a two-year Dallas Police Department effort designed to directly attack the major profit source utilized by burglars in disposing of stolen property—businesses which deal in used merchandise, whether or not they knowingly deal in stolen property. Elements of the project include:

1. Utilization of 26 investigators, with appropriate equipment and training, and supervision by three sergeants, with clerical support by two clerks.

2. Inspection on a routine basis of approximately 279 known businesses engaged in buying and selling used property.

3. Intensive effort to locate, identify, and prosecute those “fences” who knowingly receive and conceal stolen property.

The second year of the project will consist of continuation of inspection, investigative, and prosecution activities, with emphasis on overall evaluation of the project as to its effectiveness and feasibility for retention and/or expansion.
The national goal of the Impact program is the reduction of stranger-to-stranger street crimes by 5 percent in two years and by 20 percent in five years. The goal of this project and the Dallas Police Department will be:

1. Reduction of receivers of stolen property through active prosecution.
2. Reduction of profit potential in Impact offenses involving stolen property.
3. Apprehension of impact burglars and thieves, with resulting prosecution and conviction.
4. Increased return of stolen property to rightful owners.

It is expected that the activities included in this project will contribute to Impact goals by:

1. Diminishing the profit motive in Impact property crimes, thus lessening offender motivation to commit those crimes.
2. Reducing the availability of “fences” or receivers of stolen property.

**EVALUATION:**

1. Number of businesses checked or inspected.
2. Amount of stolen property recovered and returned.
3. Number of arrests of “fences” and resulting prosecutions.
4. Number of arrests of Impact offenders as a direct result of this project.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$336,493</td>
<td>$288,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44,866</td>
<td>38,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67,299</td>
<td>57,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$448,658</td>
<td>$384,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT PROJECT 1.2
REAL-TIME TACTICAL DEPLOYMENT

PROBLEM:

The Dallas Police Department currently lacks the ability to identify, analyze, and predict
Impact crime problems on a real-time basis. The present method of problem identification and
analysis is limited in that it employs a manual massage of crime data. Too often, this method
does not identify the problems early enough to forecast and prevent a significant number of
offenses. Currently, an average of eight days is required to determine crime patterns to a sufficient
degree to guide tactical deployment efforts. The current method of problem data analysis is
limited in scope and precludes a thorough factor correlation among all of the files in the data base.

Average time required to disseminate this information is five days. These delays place tactical
resources in the position of following rather than anticipating problems.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Reduce the time required to determine Impact crime problems and offense/offender concen­
trations and patterns from eight days to immediate recognition. Assumption: Certain Impact
offenses, especially robbery and burglary, given a specific level of analysis, lend themselves to
a predictive capability at a high level of probability. The introduction of computer analysis
will increase the speed, accuracy and capability of planners far above the current level.

2. Develop a method of identifying and forecasting Impact target locations to assist in implemen­
tation of the Helicopter Alert and the Expansion of Tactical Deployment projects.
Assumption: Sophisticated crime analysis can pinpoint and prioritize specific Impact crime
targets so that sensor equipment may be installed for rapid helicopter response.

3. Develop and implement a method of automated analysis of all criminal data concerning an
identified problem or target. Assumption: The amount of data input anticipated to maximize
the effectiveness of this project will require a sophisticated system far more efficient than
current manual approaches.

4. Experiment with and develop a systemized method of forecasting crime problems and criminal
movement. Assumption: That sufficient data input coupled with the use of computer services
will permit a high degree of predictive capability, thus allowing a corresponding deployment
of sufficient tactical resources and a subsequent increase in apprehensions or preventive actions.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Real-Time Tactical Deployment Project is a three-year Dallas Police Department effort
designed to develop the necessary software system for Impact crime problem identification,
analysis, and prediction on as near a real-time basis as possible. Among the activities of this
project are included:

1. In the first year, funds have been requested in order to contract with a vendor to develop
an automated crime problem identification and analysis capability, followed by initiation
of a study as to the predictive capability of the software design.

2. The second year of funding will emphasize further utilization of vendor services to continue
refinement of system design and adaptation of proven forecasting techniques to the working
procedures of the Police Department.

3. The third year of funding will emphasize further refinement of the system, to include
easy integration of software into the city’s existing computer hardware. No permanent
hardware acquisition is anticipated by this project as one of the criteria for vendor selec­
tion will be private access to computer services.
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The goal of this project and the Dallas Police Department will be to:
1. Manipulate pertinent data in order to allocate and deploy appropriate tactical resources on a real-time basis for the purpose of prevention and/or apprehension of Impact offenders.
2. Define software system design which can be integrated into existing hardware in order to have daily access to problem identification.
3. Develop the ability to produce sophisticated analyses of pertinent data in order to isolate Impact crime problems and patterns to a small geographical area and forecast the probability of criminal attack.

This project will contribute to Impact goals by:
1. Enhancing prevention and/or apprehension capability through more effective deployment of tactical resources.
2. Permitting police administrators to allocate tactical resources to specific problem areas on both a real-time and cost effective basis, thus maximizing service return.
3. Providing significant reduction of Impact offenses through more thorough problem identification.

**EVALUATION**

1. **Measures of Effectiveness**
   - Statistical changes in the city-wide crime picture before, during, and after tactical deployment to specific problems pointed out by the real-time system. (Offense reductions of 50 percent in each problem area within ten days after deployment culminating to an eventual 20 percent long term reduction city-wide.)
   - The number of offenses occurring against a victim (business, residence, persons, or geographic areas) predicted compared to number of offenses occurring against all possible victims in the vicinity. The acceptable level of predictive success will be determined by experimentation.

2. **Measures of Efficiency**
   - Reduction in pattern recognition time from the current average of eight days to immediate recognition by the computer.
   - Reduction in information dissemination time from the current five days to the same day the problem occurs.
   - Improvement in the quality of arrests made as indicated by the comparison of Impact arrests made under this project with the number of arrests accepted for prosecution. The Impact arrests made under this project should approach a 100 percent prosecution level.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>2,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47,060</td>
<td>26,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $73,727
PROBLEM:
Stranger-to-Stranger crimes and burglary are the major problems in the City of Dallas. These crimes often concentrate in geographical areas in patterns that cannot be readily handled by routine patrol procedures. As an example, Impact offenses increased 18.1 percent in the first five (5) months of 1972. Sufficient manpower has not been available for deployment in order to harden Impact crime targets and thus reduce criminal opportunities and inhibit the potential offender. First-year funding of this project provided for 116 new sworn personnel with which to deploy against this problem. Those specific strategical and tactical approaches which will maximize resolution of these problems remain to be explored and validated.

OBJECTIVES:
1. Reduction of Impact offenses in each selected target area by 50 percent within thirty (30) days of deployment.
   Assumption: That early identification of an Impact crime trend, coupled with immediate and effective tactical deployment, will both deter offenders and increase in-the-act apprehensions.
2. Maximized cost effectiveness in selection of appropriate strategies to cope with any given Impact crime problem.
   Assumption: That not only can the degree of effectiveness of any given strategy in combating a problem be adequately measured, but also the direct and indirect costs arising from selection of that strategy. Comparison and analysis of these factors will provide police administrators with an arsenal of strategies which better guarantee maximum service return for resources expended.
3. Reduction in response time to each Impact Offense in an assigned target area to three minutes.
   Assumption: That enhanced police presence will support real-time capabilities in discovering and responding to Impact offenses.
4. Increased on-the-scene arrests of Impact offenders by 100 percent over routine patrol deployment.
   Assumption: Same as Number 3.

IMPLEMENTATION:
The Tactical Expansion Project is a three-year effort designed to explore, experiment with, and develop strategies that will act to increase Impact crime deterrence, on-the-scene arrests, and thus reduce Impact offenses throughout the city.

During the life of the project, a number of activities will be carried on to meet project objectives:
1. Provision of adequate manpower for tactical assignments on a cost effective basis.
2. Selection of target Impact crime locations through thorough analysis of crime trends and patterns which indicate high probability of criminal attack.
3. Experimentation with a variety of innovative strategies to determine effectiveness.

The third year of the project will continue these activities in the same fashion to further evaluate results in terms of Impact crime. Those strategies proven as effective and reliable will become part of regular working procedure while techniques proven ineffective will be abandoned.
**EVALUATION**

1. Measures of effectiveness will include:
   a. Number of Impact crimes in assigned areas by type of offense.
   b. Number of related arrests in target areas.

2. Measures of efficiency will include:
   a. Degree of reduction in average response time.
   b. Time required to reduce Impact offenses by 50 percent in a target area.

3. Cost analysis of individual tactics in comparison with results, as well as comparison with similar control areas where routine patrol is utilized.

4. Methods of Analysis:
   - By asserting the number of Impact offenses occurring in an assigned area during the ten days the problem is worked. This will be compared to a like number of days prior to commencement to determine a percent of change.
   - Offense measurements will be made for the thirty days prior to commencement and the thirty days following it to determine the residual effect of tactical deployment.
   - Arrest activity will also be consideed as one of several indicators for evaluation. The per man Impact offense arrest for the Crime Control Units during the working period will be compared to the per man arrest for the corresponding Patrol Sergeant Sector prior to working period. It can be expected that the Crime Control Unit will be able to effect double the Impact arrest of Patrol considering their 100 percent concentration on Impact offenses.
   - There are areas in Dallas that for sociological reasons always have a high incidence of Impact offenses. A Crime Control Unit may be deployed in this type area for thirty days or more. If so, their effect will be measured by comparing the Impact offense rate for that area before, during, and after a working time period. The pre- and post-time periods will be equal to the working period.
   - At least annually, all Crime Control Unit efforts will be analyzed to determine the type or types of tactical deployment that are most cost effective. Average man-hours required per arrest and/or the man-hours required to substantially reduce offenses will be compared to determine which tactical deployment techniques are most cost effective.
   - Response time for Impact calls in an assigned area will be compared to the citywide average.
   - Displacement of offenses will be analyzed by comparing the areas surrounding the assigned area in the same manner as the assigned area to determine a percent of change in offense occurrence.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,470,882</td>
<td>$1,532,647</td>
<td>$3,003,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196,117</td>
<td>204,353</td>
<td>400,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,067,200</td>
<td>$1,119,000</td>
<td>$2,186,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,734,200</td>
<td>$2,856,000</td>
<td>$5,590,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Local match is actually much more than 15 percent because of the intended utilization of additional personnel to be devoted to the project.
PROBLEM:

1. Crime Problems

Dallas, like all core cities, is experiencing a high crime rate. In 1972 Dallas had 45,213 Index offenses (5,495 per 100,000 population.) Of these, 29,345 were Impact related and of these Impact related offenses, a majority were burglary offenses (21,475). There was a 17 percent increase in burglaries over 1971.

Of the burglary offenses occurring in 1972, 22 percent were from unlocked buildings and in an additional 6 percent of the cases, the perpetrator had a key. In two-thirds of all burglaries, the perpetrator gained entrance through a door. The citizens of Dallas lost $5 1/2 million dollars to burglars last year and only 10 percent of this was recovered and returned to the victim. Therefore, it appears that multitude of these burglary offenses can be prevented by action on the part of the victim.

Although statistics are not available, it can be assumed that many of the other Impact-related offenses could be prevented by the victim if the knowledge and motivation were present.

2. Motivation Problems

The Dallas Police Department has several programs for citizen involvement in the reduction and prevention of crime. These include Operation: Get Involved (monthly beat meetings), Computer Identification System, Crime Prevention Team and a Speaker’s Bureau.

The problem exists in determining how to motivate the public to utilize the programs available.

The Dallas Police Departments’ Operation: Get Involved Program has been in existence for three years. It consists of a monthly meeting between the beat officers and the citizens on each of the 11 police beats. It is designed as a communication vehicle and has been successful when utilized.

Attendance at these meetings is approximately 30,000 per year. It is felt that limited publicity is the cause of this limited attendance. However, it is also felt that increased publicity would have to have a motivation force attendant in order to substantially increase attendance.

In addition to these Operation: Get Involved groups, the Dallas Police Department has access to many other civic groups where they have an opportunity to motivate citizens to increase their security and assist in crime prevention. The opportunity is available, yet there is a need for training in motivating via public speaking and professional information preparation.

This education and information exchange is needed to motivate the public to take action such as improving security of their person and/or property. A Dallas Police Department program entitled “Computer Identification System (Big CIS)” is available to the public to increase security of property. However, less than 4 percent of the public has taken advantage of this program, probably due to lack of knowledge and motivation.

A means of informing and motivating the public to assist in reducing crime must be developed before crime prevention programs will be truly effective.

The average citizen of the City of Dallas knows that crime in general is an area of concern for the city, the state and the nation. But the imminent possibility that his home and family will be affected by theft and violence has been rationalized away by cliches like, “It always happens to the other guy” and “That kind of thing doesn’t happen in my neighborhood.” Even in areas of high incidence of personal crime, the “other guy” myth persists.
There is a need for a creative approach that will “personalize” the stranger-to-stranger crime problem. The individual citizen of Dallas must be convinced that even though he does not personally suffer at the hand of a criminal, each time a stranger-to-stranger crime is committed, he is affected — through increased insurance rates, higher taxes for protection, expanded court systems, the bad press that a convention city like Dallas can ill afford and the quality of life in the area.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Educate 30 percent (261,000) of the population in means of Impact crime reduction. Assumption: Many Impact crimes would not occur if the citizens were more aware of ways to reduce crime.

2. Motivate 20 percent (176,000) of the population to make a crime reduction effort. This objective is broken down as follows:
   - Operation Get Involved (50 percent increase in attendance directly attributable to program.)
   - Computer Identification System (20 percent of homes and businesses registered in one year attributable to project.)
   - Target Hardening (20 percent of 176,000 educated and claiming to practice program means.)
   (Survey)

3. Test target hardening effectiveness as follows:
   - Perform 5,200 security inspections.
   - Increase Computer Identification System registrations by 25,000.
   - Test and control area on crime statistics.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The CATCH Project is a Dallas Police Department, three-year effort designed to obtain community involvement in reducing crime. This is an effort combining police resources and mass media communications. It will consist of three major tasks:

1. Motivation is the prime objective of the media campaign. This motivation will be obtained through the media as follows:
   a. Creation of a real concern about crime. Bring about the realization that no one is immune to the possibility that they could become a victim of crime.
   b. Appeal to human emotion to act as a motivator. The desire for security, self-protection, civic pride and involvement will be used as a motivator.
   c. Dissemination of information on methods of preventing an individual from becoming a victim.
   d. Dissemination of information on how to get involved in the fight against crime.

2. Education on crime prevention will consist of production and airing of radio and television commercials as well as newspaper reaction on the part of the public. Response will be made to telephone and mail requests for additional information and educational material. This project will also be responsible for securing and maintaining a broad range of collateral material produced by the advertising agency for dissemination to the public.

3. The third task will be to test the cost effectiveness of “Target Hardening” by utilization of a community awareness team. This team will conduct an experimental design to test the crime reduction brought about by intensive “Target Hardening” on the part of each property owner, enrollment in the Computer Identification System, and the establishment of neighborhood security groups. The project will test and document two hypotheses:
a. The Dallas Police Department can motivate the public to become beneficially involved in crime reduction.

b. Public involvement will lead to an identifiable crime reduction.

The third-year of the project will be devoted to the continuation of the first and second year activities and to the implementation of whatever changes that are deemed necessary by evaluation. Any ineffective parts of the project will be dropped.

The goal of the CATCH project and the Dallas Police Department is to reduce Impact crime by means of combining efforts of police resources and mass media communications through achieving means of:

a. Motivation of the public.

b. Education on crime prevention.

c. Information on how to get citizens involved.

It is expected that the programs listed above will contribute to the reduction of stranger-to-stranger crime and burglary in Dallas by:

a. Reaching and motivating a substantial number of citizens.

b. Facilitating a lower Impact crime rate in the area due to the increased public awareness of what the situation is and how to prevent themselves from becoming a victim.

c. Increasing participation in on-going programs such as the Computer Identification System, which will not only protect property but can lead to the arrest of suspects.

EVALUATION:

1. The measures of effectiveness are:

   • The number of people informed of the Police Department Community Involvement programs via the mass communications.

   • The percent of increase in the present beat committees.

   • The number of new beat committees organized.

   • The percent of the population by households that are enrolled in the Computer Identification System.

   • The percent of specific Impact offense reduction in a target area after a Community Awareness Team saturates the area.

2. The measures of efficiency will be:

   • Awareness of advertising (unaided and specific), in total by medium. Unaided awareness is the percentage of respondents who spontaneously say they are aware of advertising for the Dallas Police Department without any probing or aiding on the part of the interviewer. Aided awareness is the percentage of respondents who claim to be aware of the advertising by the Dallas Police Department in response to a question like, "Have you seen or heard of advertising lately for the Dallas Police Department?". Specific awareness is the percentage of respondents who verify their awareness by playing back one or more copy points, visual elements, etc. of the ads themselves.

   • Awareness (unaided or aided) of various categories of crime in Dallas.

   • Awareness (unaided) of various measures that individuals can take to assist themselves and the Dallas Police Department in the reduction of stranger-to-stranger crimes.

   • Awareness of various information materials available to better acquaint the general public with the subject of stranger-to-stranger crime.
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**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>$722,964</td>
<td>$785,453</td>
<td>$1,508,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>96,395</td>
<td>104,727</td>
<td>201,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>144,593</td>
<td>157,090</td>
<td>580,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$963,925</td>
<td>$1,047,270</td>
<td>$2,962,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROBLEM:

In 1971 the City of Dallas had 46,400 Index offenses, of which 27,257 were Impact crimes. Of the 10,226 arrests arising from the 46,400 Index crimes, only 1,921 subsequent convictions were obtained — approximately one conviction per 24 Index offenses.

Dallas experienced 45,213 Index crimes in 1972. Out of this number, 26,070 were Impact-related. Arrests for Index crimes totaled 11,138: (Conviction figures for 1972 are not readily available.)

Within the city, crime occurred most frequently in the Southeast District during 1972. Analysis of crimes by district indicates that 12,162 of the 45,213 Index crimes (26.9 percent) occurred in the Southeast District.

The following shows the percentage of 1972 Impact crimes in the City of Dallas that occurred in the Southeast District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Percent in Southeast District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an average investigative manpower strength of 136 officers available for follow-up work. However, they also have additional responsibilities which divert them from investigation, such as lesser crimes, prisoners, court, etc. This means that the investigator, besides these duties, is expected to handle an average 17 Impact offenses adequately each month. The result is a strong indication that current investigative efforts may be ineffective.

The problem is to define new approaches to criminal investigation which, on a cost effective basis will provide greater return for effort and resources expended. This is also an area in which little or no research has been conducted to provide some direction.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Increase the aggregate Impact offense clearance rate, with case filed, by 10 percent during the second full year of operation. Assumption: That the application of this in-depth approach in a pilot area which provides a major portion of Impact crimes will significantly affect the overall city-wide Impact crime clearance rate.

2. Increase and improve case preparation to lead to a 10 percent increase in true bills. Assumption: That a “storybook” approach to criminal investigation will enhance the quality of effort necessary to sustain such improvement.

3. Increase and improve case preparation to lead to a 10 percent increase in convictions. Assumption: That a “storybook” approach to criminal investigation will enhance the quality of effort necessary to sustain such improvement.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Crime Investigation Pilot Study is a three-year effort designed to increase arrest rates of Impact offenders, enhance prosecution efforts and subsequent convictions, as well as define suitable investigative techniques to maximize efficiency of the Dallas Police Department in coping with these crimes.
During the life of the project, a number of activities will be carried on to meet project objectives:

1. Decentralization of criminal investigators to a pilot area (Southeast District) and increase of the investigator complement to adequately support this project.

2. Assignment of investigators to preliminary investigation of Impact offenses reported in the pilot area, as well as conduct of crime scene search and followup investigation, i.e., thorough, in-depth, “storybook” procedures.

3. Increased application of available scientific aids and facilities to Impact crime investigations in the pilot area.

4. Emphasis on comparison of in-depth “storybook” investigations with traditional approaches to determine accurate cost effectiveness data as well as overall results.

The third year of the project will see the continuance of this effort with a view toward feasibility of expansion of the approach, given the overall evaluation of the project in terms of cost effectiveness and overall results.

The goal of this project and the Dallas Police Department is to:

1. Gain a higher rate of apprehensions and prosecution of offenders who escape the scene of Impact crimes.

2. Study cost effectiveness of the deployment of investigative personnel to determine the most appropriate police expenditure to meet a priority goal of crime prevention and deterrence.

These results will contribute to the reduction of stranger-to-stranger street crimes and burglary in Dallas by:


2. Maximizing application of investigative personnel against Impact offenses, if proven cost effective.

3. Providing new data bases for determining the identity of potential law violators and potential victims.

4. Providing for development of improved techniques which will enhance investigative training and procedures.

**EVALUATION:**

1. The effectiveness of this project will be measured in terms of:
   - Reduction of Impact offenses in Southeast compared to the remainder of the city.
   - Increase in the clearance rate.
   - Increase in the true-bill ratio.
   - Increase in the conviction rate.

2. The efficiency of this project will be measured by:
   - Average number of manhours required to properly prepare a case.
   - Investigator response time to a crime scene.

3. Analysis will be performed at three month intervals by the project director and his staff to ascertain progress toward attainment of objectives. Based on the analytical findings, decisions will be made as to whether the project should be continued as is, redirected or eliminated.
Crime rates will be compared with the previous year's statistics to measure project impact. Impact crimes will include, as per the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report definitions, murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault and burglary. An Impact crime rate will be calculated as the number of reported crimes per unit of population during the time interval under evaluation.

The clearance rate will be compared to the remainder of the city worked by centralized investigation. Similar comparisons will be made with true-bill ratio and conviction rate.

Manhours and response time will be analyzed in connection with the success of the project to determine the cost/benefit of the hypothesis.

Prior to 1973, stranger-to-stranger crimes were not adequately identified. Therefore, two distinct sets of statistics will have to be analyzed for comparison.

1. When comparing project area to centralized Criminal Investigation Division, stranger-to-stranger Impact offenses will be used.

2. When comparing the project statistics to its own base year of 1972, all Impact offenses will be used on the assumption that a reduction in all offenses will have a commensurate decrease of stranger-to-stranger offenses.

Up to 90 days will be required to implement this project, accounting for securing resources and manpower and training on project objectives and methods. Analysis for project success will begin at the end of this implementation.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$859,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$114,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$171,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,146,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 2.0

REDUCE STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES OF MURDER, RAPE, ROBBERY, AND AGGRAVATED ASSAULT IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 2% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Police Artist</td>
<td>$6,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Expand Crime Lab and Increase Training of Police Dept.</td>
<td>228,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Upgrade Response of Criminal Justice System</td>
<td>15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Violent Crime Information Exchange Project</td>
<td>24,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

The incidence of violent Impact crimes occurring in the City of Dallas is a major problem. For example, during 1972, the following crimes were reported:

- 192 murders,
- 533 rapes,
- 2,616 robberies.

A significant portion of these crimes are still unsolved. For instance, 1,646 of the robberies (63 percent) are unsolved; 181 rapes are unsolved (34 percent), and 8 percent of the murders are not cleared. These crimes frequently lead to an excessive amount of death, personal injury, and stolen property. In almost all crimes of violence, there is a face-to-face confrontation between the victim and the offender. Circulating only the physical description of the offender to law enforcement personnel is most often inadequate because of the broad nature of the description which makes it applicable to a substantial number of people. However, the use of detailed composite suspect drawings composed by an artist from a description of the offender, provided by the victim, would result in increased identification and apprehension of murder, rape, and robbery offenders.

OBJECTIVES:

The suspect description capability on the part of the victim in crimes of murder, rape, and robbery will be enhanced by the capability of the police to prepare realistic detailed composite suspect drawing. This will aid in the achievement of the following objectives:

1. Increase the clearance rate of murders by 1 percent in one year. This would result in a clearance of 93 percent of all murders.
2. Increase the clearance rate of robbery offenses by 5 percent in one year. This would result in a clearance of 42 percent of all reported robberies.
3. Increase the clearance rate of rape offenses by 5 percent. 71 percent of all reported rape offenses would be solved during 1973.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Police Artist Project is a three-year effort designed to enhance criminal identification in serious Impact crimes, thus permitting higher apprehension rates and clearances. The project includes:

1. Contracting with qualified artists on an as-needed basis for composite drawings. It is anticipated that an artist would be utilized approximately 30 times each month.
2. Victim-Artist contact for optimal composite results.
3. Dissemination of suspect drawings to police personnel and other area law enforcement agencies.

Third-year funding will emphasize a continuation of the activity and final evaluation as to the desirability and feasibility of staffing the Dallas Police Department with this capability.

EVALUATION:

The Police Artist Project will be evaluated monthly in terms of the following measurements:

1. The number of murders, rapes, and robberies.
2. The monthly crime rates for murder, rape, and robbery.
3. The number of murders, rapes, and robberies cleared by arrest.
4. The monthly clearance rate of murder, rape, and robbery.

5. The number of murders, rapes, and robberies cleared by arrest after a composite has been drawn.

6. The clearance rate of those cases where a composite was drawn.

7. The number of cases where a composite is drawn.

IN ADDITION:

A. Analysis will be performed at three month intervals to ascertain progress toward attainment of objectives. Based on the analytical findings, decisions will be made as to whether the project should be continued as is, redirected, or eliminated.

B. Monthly crime rates will be compared with the previous year's statistics to measure project impact. An Impact crime rate will be calculated as the number of actual crimes per unit of population during the time interval under evaluation.

C. Monthly clearance rates for murders, rape, and robberies will be compared to the clearance rate for same crimes one year earlier.

D. The clearance rate of those cases where a composite is used will be compared to the clearance rate of those cases where a composite was not used.

E. Prior to 1973, stranger-to-stranger crimes were not adequately identified. Therefore, two distinct sets of statistics will have to be analyzed for comparison. When comparing the project statistics to its base year, all Impact offenses will be used on the assumption that a reduction in all offenses will have a commensurate decrease of stranger-to-stranger offenses.

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>$12,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>2,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,236</td>
<td>$16,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT PROJECT 2.2
EXPAND CRIME LAB AND INCREASE TRAINING OF POLICE DEPARTMENT

PROBLEM:

Approximately 90 percent of the cases handled by the Crime Investigation Laboratory are received from the Dallas Police Department. In 1972 the crime lab was submitted physical evidence in 2,749 cases. During 1972 in the City of Dallas there were 45,213 Index crimes identified by police. These crimes included 192 murders, 533 rapes, 2,616 robberies, 4,529 aggravated assaults, and 21,475 burglaries. Additionally, 2,816 indictments for illicit use of narcotics were returned by Dallas County Grand Juries.

The Crime Investigation Laboratory performed examinations and analysis of drugs in approximately 2,400 cases with a significant segment of cases requiring examination for more than one drug. All homicide cases were provided evidence examined and analyzed by the Crime Investigation Laboratory. In cases of rape, robbery, and burglary the submission of physical evidence for Crime Lab investigation was considerably less. The low incidence of submission of physical evidence for these cases and the need for recognition, collection and preservation of physical evidence are major problems. Another problem area relates to a delay in communicating the results of the examinations and the analysis of physical evidence to the police department.

Laboratory overload is created by the number of drug examinations and analyses. Drug abuse has been directly linked to stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary. In all stranger-to-stranger crimes, physical evidence is often the only type of valuable evidence that relates the suspect to the crime. Proper recognition, collection, and transmission of physical evidence and unimpeded transmission of results is essential.

OBJECTIVES:

This project will attempt to:

1. Provide services not now available nor available in the predictable future through local funding. Approximately 8,200 tests and analyses will be performed during the first year.
2. Increase laboratory productivity and to increase the speed of reporting results to law enforcement agencies from over two days to 10 minutes within one year.
3. Provide training of 1,700 law enforcement officers and forensic scientists in physical evidence and scientific crime and death investigation.
4. Provide in-service training for personnel involved in the scientific investigation of crime and death in the Institute of Forensic Sciences.
5. Provide for long-term planning for future programs, and to establish communication and liaison with other centers involved in forensic science endeavors.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Crime Lab is a three-year project designed to improve the capacity and operation of the crime laboratory and thereby assist in the reduction of stranger-to-stranger crime and burglary.

1. This project will provide new and more sophisticated electronic equipment for the Crime Lab to be used to process evidence in criminal cases.
2. The project will provide training for area law enforcement personnel on handling and preservation of evidence in order to increase successful prosecution rates by the introduction of "good" evidence in the courts.
3. A reduction will also occur in the amount of data sent elsewhere for analysis. New instruments and techniques will permit the Crime Investigation Laboratory to provide...
a greater number of more comprehensive examinations of physical evidence and an expanded training program for law enforcement officers. Also provided will be more useable evidence in the prosecution of stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.

**Evaluation:**

This project will be measured quarterly in terms of the following items:

1. Number of new examinations performed which are not presently possible with existing instrumentation.
2. Decrease in the average time required to perform examinations and analyses.
3. Decrease in the average time to report results of examinations and analyses to the Dallas Police Department.
4. Number of police officers, Institute staff members, and others receiving training at the Institute of Forensic Sciences.
5. Increase in the number of requests for examination and analyses of physical evidence.
6. The subjective evaluation by Criminal Investigation Laboratory staff of the selection and better preservation of physical evidence presented for examination and analysis.
7. The subjective evaluation by the Dallas and other area police departments of the use of improved analyses, faster reporting of results, and increased training programs.
8. The subjective evaluation of this project by qualified individuals from criminalistics laboratories in other areas of the country.

**Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAA (Part C)</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$376,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$501,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

There are over 85 terminals from 30 Dallas area police departments accessing the Criminal Name Index File plus six Dallas County criminal justice departments (District Attorney's Office, Sheriff's Department, District Courts, District Clerk, County Clerk, and Adult Probation) accessing various other files of the Regional Criminal Justice System such as the Book-in and Custody File, the Judicial Information System Files, Adult Probation, District Attorney's Files, and the Name Index File.

In addition to the increased use of the Regional Switcher and Criminal Justice Files for operational purposes, the Impact Program is expected to place an additional strain on the Regional Criminal Information System.

Prior to implementation of Amigos Hyper Faster II, Dallas County was faced with the problems of:
1. Excessive inquiry response time (20 seconds or more) and
2. C.P.U. core limitations.

The approximate 350 K core requirements of the system in the last quarter of 1972 precluded additional criminal justice applications which were urgently needed.

During the first year of this project, total criminal justice transaction volume has increased from approximately 16,000 to approximately 29,850 per day, and average inquiry response time has been reduced from more than 20 seconds to five seconds or less.

Rather than having to increase core storage by 128,000 bytes (which would have resulted in an annual increase of $57,120 in operating costs), Amigos Hyper Faster II has enabled Dallas County to add applications relative to Book-in and Custody, Adult Probation, and the Judicial Information System within a total core requirement of 316 K bytes.

The time required to process offenders into the County Jail exemplifies a function in the criminal justice system where faster response time from the computer system is critical.

Prior to Amigos Hyper Faster II, the portion of the Book-in function relative to computer access requires approximately 10 minutes per prisoner. At approximately 225 persons per day, this was roughly 37.5 hours per day involved in this phase of book-in.

Since project implementation this time has been reduced to three minutes per prisoner or a total of 11 hours per day.

OBJECTIVES:

The primary objective of this project is the implementation and maintenance of a software system which will reduce average inquiry response time into the Regional Criminal Information System from an average of over 20 seconds to five seconds or less, and maintain this reduced level during a three-year period.

Additional objectives include:
- Conservation of core storage to permit additional applications required to support Impact Program information needs.
- Reduce processing time for Impact Offenders being booked into the County Jail. Assumption: Amigos-Hyper Faster II will reduce response time for data inquiry so the book-in procedure is shortened.
Increase efficiency in the judicial system and complement the efforts of personnel involved in the Impact project for the Criminal District Courts. Assumption: Judges and attorneys access the data in the Court Sub-System approximately 5,000 times a day. By reducing the response time to five seconds, a significant time savings (approximately 20.83 hours per day) can be realized for court personnel.

Increase operating efficiency of area law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. Assumption: Around 30 or 40 Dallas area law enforcement and criminal justice agencies have access to the Criminal Name Index File, which is on-line at the Dallas County Regional Criminal Justice Computer Center. A response time of five seconds or less per inquiry is vital to the efficiency of inquiring agencies and to the safety of officers in the field.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The first phase of implementation of this project has been accomplished by the Dallas County Information Systems Department.

The first year of implementation involved the conversion of 203 Regional Criminal Justice Information System Programs and purchase and installation of Amigos Hyper Faster II, an advanced state of the art access method and teleprocessing monitor manufactured by the Comress Corporation.

Maintenance and enhancements of the Amigos Hyper Faster II package planned for the second and third years are as follows:

1. Additional software support for terminals and required interfaces not currently in use in the North Central Texas Region.

2. Periodic optimization (restructuring of files, adjusting to wait time problems, etc.) as necessary.

3. Conversion to VS/VM (Virtual Storage/Virtual Machine) to maintain a 3-5 second response time.

4. On-going maintenance including permanent/temporary fixes (fine-tuning of the system) and upgrading of OS to Hyper Faster II.

These activities will be performed by a Dallas County Systems Analyst devoting 25 percent of his time. Additional support will be provided on an as-needed basis by the Comress Corporation.

EVALUATION:

Quantitative Measures

1. Average response time of teleprocessing inquiries measured in seconds, comparing Amigos-Hyper Faster II and the previous system, Faster M.T.

2. Savings in core storage requirements — measured in terms of number of bytes required for selected benchmarks under the old system vs. the number of bytes required using Amigos Hyper Faster II.

3. Savings in computer time (hours per month) in criminal justice file reorganization using Amigos as compared with the previous system.

Subjective Measures

1. Externally, the project will be evaluated by Regional Criminal Justice System users, primarily law enforcement agencies within the area. These agencies will be requested to help in the evaluation of the Amigos Hyper Faster II software system by comparing pre- and post-implementation inquiry response times. Quantitative criteria for evaluation will be the reduction of system response to inquiries to five seconds or less.
2. Ease of program conversion.
3. Ease of programmer training — measured in number of hours required as compared to other conversions of similar magnitude.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

The "traveling criminal" has long been a problem for local law enforcement agencies, especially in the areas of more violent Impact offenses. No effective intelligence systems have yet been developed to cope with the ease with which the modern mobile criminal moves between jurisdictions, either intent on committing offenses in a different region or fleeing from apprehension for crimes committed in the jurisdiction being left.

Local law enforcement agencies have little information to depend on other than the singular initiative of some officer who may have information about mobile criminal activities and takes it upon himself to notify other agencies in order to prepare for police activity to deal with the offender(s). There is an obvious interjurisdictional intelligence vacuum which requires a concerted effort to track such mobile criminals and disseminate such information for both prevention and apprehension strategies. The development of necessary base line data in order to more specifically isolate and define the problem rests with first-year activities in this project.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Increase of local law enforcement agency participation from 17 to 25 in the second year of project life. Assumption: Early successes following implementation of this project will motivate such increased participation.

2. Receipt and dissemination of an average 75 intelligence/information items per month during the second year. Assumption: With increased participation, there should, accordingly, be an increase in intelligence and information concerning mobile criminal activities.

3. An average of ten apprehensions of Impact offenders within participating jurisdictions each month of the second year as a direct result of this project. Assumption: By expanding the project, thus permitting, in essence, an expansion of police resources and intelligence capability, Impact offenders will stand a greater chance of being observed, intercepted, and apprehended.

4. Reduction of Impact crimes committed by "traveling criminals" by 10 percent. Assumption: Increased apprehension of mobile criminals will result in a reduction of Impact crimes which would have been committed by these offenders if they had remained at large.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Violent Crime Information Exchange Project is a three-year effort designed to develop both a national directory and regional clearinghouse for dissemination of information relating to the activities of violent Impact offense violators who travel among differing police jurisdictions. Elements of this project include:

1. Development and subsequent update of a national directory of law enforcement commanders responsible for investigation of Impact target crimes and other offenses.

2. Creation of a regional clearinghouse for dissemination of information relating to these offenses and the activities and whereabouts of suspected offenders.

3. Encouragement of voluntary active participation and intelligence-sharing by a maximum number of local law enforcement agencies.

The first year of the project was devoted to the development of a national directory, definition of a formalized plan for the dissemination of information on a regional basis, and recruitment of local law enforcement agencies for the actual implementation of a regional clearinghouse.
Second-year refunding will involve preparation of regional guidelines and procedures, based on first-year experiences, to be made available to other agencies seeking to implement similar projects. In addition, the national directory will be updated and efforts will be made to enlist additional law enforcement agencies in the North Texas area to participate in the regional clearinghouse.

The third year of the project will consist of continuation and expansion of project capability and participation, with emphasis on overall evaluation as to impact and results in terms of Impact offenses and offenders scrutinized. A determination of the value of the project and feasibility and desirability of continuing and expanding the effort will result.

The goal of this project and the Dallas Police Department will be:
1. To enhance prevention of offenses and apprehension of violent Impact crime offenders through an expanded intelligence and investigative capability.
2. Develop a closer cooperative relationship among local law enforcement agencies in order to close ranks against the mobile criminals.
3. To increase convictions of such mobile criminals through such cooperation.

It is expected that the activities which fall under this project will contribute to Impact goals by:
1. Reduction of stranger-to-stranger offenses by those criminals whose *modus operandi* emphasizes high interjurisdictional mobility.
2. Increased intelligence, investigative, and preventive posture on the part of participating agencies.
3. Increased clearances in Impact offenses as a result of apprehension of suspected offenders who have fled the jurisdiction where the offense occurred.
4. Greater analysis posture, as a result of informational dissemination and feedback, to track and monitor organized and other criminal efforts on an interjurisdictional basis.

**EVALUATION:**
1. A comparison of first and second year project results.
   a. Total number of individual agencies actively participating in the information-sharing process.
   b. Total number of information items received and disseminated.
   c. Total number of apprehensions and prosecutions resulting directly from this project’s activities in participating jurisdictions including Dallas.
   d. Total number of Impact crimes in Dallas and adjacent areas.
2. Monthly reports submitted by each participating agency.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24,617</td>
<td>24,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>3,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>4,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32,822</td>
<td>32,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd Year Total: $32,822
3rd Year Total: $32,822
Total: $65,644
**IMPACT CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 3.0**

REDUCE JUVENILE RELATED STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARIES IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 3% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Juvenile Department Court Action Processing Unit</td>
<td>$296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Juvenile Department Detention Home Medical and Logistical Program</td>
<td>116,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Youth Development Correcting and Preventing Criminal Patterns</td>
<td>148,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Youth Services Program</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,160,712</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IMPACT PROJECT 3.1

JUVENILE DEPARTMENT COURT ACTION PROCESSING UNIT

PROBLEM:

Juveniles constituted 44 percent of all arrests for burglary, 25 percent of all arrests for robbery, 20 percent of all arrests for rape, 14 percent of all arrests for aggravated assault, and 12 percent of all arrests for murder in Dallas County during 1972. Approximately 40 percent of all felony referrals to the Juvenile Department were for Impact Crimes.

The Dallas County Juvenile Department handled 8,115 referrals during 1971, including 5,802 boys. The Delinquency Division which works with felony offenders handled 5,027 cases in 1971, including 4,023 boys. In 1971, 59 percent of all felony referrals to the Juvenile Department were for stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary offenses. Of the 1,445 dispositions by the Juvenile Court in 1971, 748 offenders were placed or continued on probation; thus, the need exists for specialized and intensive supervision of a large number of probationers.

Burglary by juveniles in Dallas County is an especially serious problem, with 1,116 offenses referred to the Juvenile Department in 1971, including 551 residence burglaries, 432 business burglaries, and 183 public building burglaries.

The seriousness of juvenile felony offenses in Dallas County is indicated by the fact that in 1971, there were 404 juvenile offenses per 10,000 juvenile-age population in Dallas County. Personal violence offenses, including assault, robbery, rape and murder, rose to a total of 353 in 1971, which indicates a ratio of 18 offenses per 10,000 juvenile-age population in Dallas County. Burglaries rose in the same period to 52 per 10,000 juvenile-age population in Dallas County. In 1971, burglary accounted for 67 percent of all Impact crimes in the city of Dallas with only 22 percent clearance rate. Of all felony hearings in Juvenile Court during the same period, 13 percent were passed without an order being issued, some of which were passed for reasons of incompleteness of case study or lack of investigative and/or prosecution material.

OBJECTIVES:

a. Reduce court processing time 8 percent in 3 years (1 one percent first year, 4 percent second year, 8 percent third year.)

b. Reduce departmental referral recidivism rates by 8 percent in three years.

c. Increase counseling and supervisory services to juvenile offenders and their families by 50 percent in three years. (30 percent in the first year, 40 percent the second year, 50 percent third year.

d. Increase capability to supervise offenders who are in need of supervision but who are not adjudicated delinquents.

e. Reduce the average length of Detention Home residency of Impact offenders awaiting court hearings by one-half day in three years.

f. Reduce the time lapse between referral and disposition by 8 percent in three years.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Juvenile Department Court Action Processing Unit is a three-year project designed to institute organizational and procedural changes in order to improve the department's capability to respond to stranger-to-stranger crime and burglary. The project will provide for the separation of the functions of court processing and probation supervision. This will provide for better supervision of the court action caseworkers and will free the Probation and Supervisory caseworkers for the accomplishment of their primary duties. In addition, the project provides for a full-time legal advisor whose efforts will improve court management which will, in turn, result in speedier and more comprehensive court hearings.
**EVALUATION:**

1. Rate of juvenile pre-hearing re-referral in Dallas (before and after to be measured quarterly, and reporting on the basis of number/100,000 population.)
2. Length of stay in Detention Home (before and after.)
3. Reduction in time from referral to final disposition.
4. Increase in amount of time spent by caseworkers in pre-hearing supervision of offenders.
5. Rates of departmental post-hearing referral recidivism rates (before and after.)
6. Increase in probation and supervisory services for offenders by project completion.
7. Increase in family services and rehabilitation referrals for parents and siblings of offenders.
8. The diversion of the offender's concept of the supervisory Probation Officer as an adversary through the formation of a separate supervisory unit apart from the Court processing function.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td>$278,913</td>
<td>$574,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$616,000</td>
<td>$608,913</td>
<td>$1,224,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROBLEM:

In 1972, 6,901 juveniles were referred to the Dallas County Juvenile Department for a total of 8,318 offenses. During the same period, the Dallas County Detention Home recorded 5,723 admissions, a figure which included 4,373 individuals.

There were 16 admissions per day with an average individual Detention Home residency of six days. Ninety-five individuals were cared for in the Detention Home facility daily and 82 individuals were present for meals daily on the average. Twenty-two Group Workers were included in the total staff of 40 individuals. The Group Workers averaged 16 detained juveniles in their group activities. Detainment usually occurs immediately following apprehension and tends to be a special adolescent crisis period which requires skilled handling, if this handling is to contribute to an ultimately acceptable social adjustment. This skilled handling necessitates the use of adequate and proper facilities, a specialized program and trained personnel.

Because the Detention Home is involved in many kinds of programs designed to aid the detained juvenile in several areas of his life, the operation has become unwieldy with respect to the absence of control techniques and general overall management. In addition, there is a lack of medical personnel with respect to the inability of the Detention Home to respond in the shortest possible time to various medical emergencies. Psychological evaluation and treatment is limited in the Detention Home because of the small staff now employed in the Juvenile Department Psychological Division, thus rendering the staff unable to adequately meet the psychological needs of juveniles detained at the Detention Home. Finally, the Detention Home staff, together with the Juvenile Department Probation Officer's staff, is unable to cope with the many transportation needs of detained juveniles, with respect to both local and out of County trips, since both staffs are working at capacity in their various assignments in other areas.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To reduce response time to emergency medical situations within the Detention Home by 10 percent by December 31, 1975.
2. To reduce the time between initial detention and final adjudication by 2 percent by December 31, 1975.
3. To increase psychological testing, psychological evaluation, and rehabilitative counseling by 50 percent by December 31, 1975.
4. To reduce escapes effected during custodial transportation by 90 percent by December 31, 1975.

IMPLEMENTATION:

During this project, four basic programs will be introduced into the overall program implementation at the Dallas County Detention Home, each of which is expected to have a positive effect in management and control of the program capability of the Detention Home, the treatment of physical disorders and mental health problems of detained juveniles, and an increased custodial transportation capability.

These four basic programs will focus on:

1. The employment of a Program Director who will coordinate and implement all Detention Home programs. This worker will be a full-time employee and will be under the direction and supervision of the Superintendent of the Dallas County Detention Home.
2. The employment of a Registered Nurse together with needed equipment and supplies for this area of endeavor. The nurse will perform all necessary nursing functions including coordination of activities with Parkland Memorial Hospital physicians in normal and emergency situations, including dispensing of preventive and other shots to detained juveniles, as well as the performance of other nursing duties so as to aid in the physical rehabilitation of Impact and other offenders.

3. The employment of PhD Psychologist and a Master's Degree Assistant Staff Worker who would implement a testing, evaluation and rehabilitative counseling program for stranger-to-stranger crime and burglary and other offenders in conjunction with the Dallas County Juvenile Department Psychological Division. Necessary equipment for program implementation would be required.

4. The employment of a husband and wife team and the purchasing of a vehicle to adequately (safely and securely) transport detained juveniles. Operating expenses for the vehicle will be budgeted to permit local and out of County transportation to placement facilities along with other needed travel. Currently the Detention Home staff and the Juvenile Department Probation Officer's staff are unable to cope adequately with the transportation needs of detained juveniles due to caseload and group requirements.

**EVALUATION:**

1. Medical Program — the reduction of time spent in the Detention Home by detained juveniles between admission and Court hearing and adjudication by 1 percent by December 31, 1975.

2. Medical Program — a reduction in the response time involving detained juveniles with respect to physical quasi-emergency and emergency situations by 10 percent by December 31, 1975.

3. Psychological Services Division Program — the reduction in time spent in the Detention Home by detained juveniles from admission to Court hearing and adjudication by 2 percent by December 31, 1975.

4. Psychological Services Division Program — to increase Detention Home Psychological Services Division ability to test, evaluate and counsel with detained juveniles by 50 percent by December 31, 1975.

5. Custodial Transportation Program.
   a. A reduction in the amount of time spent by detained juveniles in the Detention Home by 2 percent by December 31, 1975 through the new transportation capability.
   b. A reduction in the cost/benefit ratio of 2 percent by December 31, 1975, as compared to the cost/benefit ratio involved in other methods.
   c. A reduction in the number of escapes of detained juveniles being transported to assigned destinations by 90 percent by December 31, 1975.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT PROJECT 3.3
YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
CORRECTING AND PREVENTING CRIMINAL PATTERNS

PROBLEM:

Juvenile delinquency continues to be a problem in Dallas. In 1972, 8,226 juvenile delinquents were booked, a 4.66 percent increase over the 1971 total. Based on statistics in the 1972 Annual Report for the Dallas Police Department, juveniles represent a substantial portion of all arrests for index crimes. Almost half of all persons arrested in 1972 for burglary and auto theft were juveniles. They figured systematically in the remaining index crimes. Based on a comparison of total arrests for burglary for 1971 (1,123), and 1972 (1,310), juvenile arrests for burglary increased by 14 percent. Arrest for aggravated assaults increased by 42 percent, for robbery by 26 percent, for rape by 50 percent, and for murder by 52 percent. Highlighting the above figures is the fact that these increases represent only those offenses and delinquents who came to the attention of the police. Of the approximately 31,000 Impact offenses reported in Dallas in 1972, an estimated 9,000 of them were committed by juveniles.

In 1972, 71.9 percent of all juveniles processed by the Youth Division were referred to the County Juvenile Department. This is well above the national average which is approximately 50 percent. One reason for the high referral rate is that there are not alternatives available at this time to the police. In addition to the increase in arrests, the recidivism rate also increased from 45.75 percent in 1971 to 64.79 percent in 1972.

OBJECTIVES:

The goals of this project address themselves to the following general areas:

a. Modify the behavior of 50 participating chronic offender youths from criminal behavior to a more wholesome activity.
b. Prevent further delinquency through diversionary activities and positive police interaction with multiple juvenile offenders and delinquents.
c. Recruit 1,020 delinquent youths into the project.
d. Reduce the recidivism rate of participating delinquents by 50 percent as compared to the rate of non-participating delinquents.
e. Develop documentation on methods by which the police can establish and maintain rapport with chronic juvenile offenders and how to modify their behavior.
f. Provide four additional alternatives for the Juvenile Justice System in dealing with delinquents.
g. Provide the Youth Division with the alternative of referring a delinquent youth to officers working in any of the four projects rather than referral to the juvenile home.
h. Reduce the number of Impact offenses known to police committed by participants by 30 percent as compared to the number committed by non-participating delinquents. (1,650 offenses).
i. Recruit 50 chronic offenders into the one-on-two program; recruit 150 delinquents into the Explorer program; recruit 800 delinquents into the athletic program; and 20 multiple female offenders into the female activities program.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Youth Development Project is a three-year effort designed to attack juvenile involvement in stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary through the availability of more wholesome
activities coupled with close relationships with selected police officers. Components of this project include:

1. The pairing of 25 officers with 50 youthful offenders. These officers will receive eight hours overtime pay per month for spending off-duty time in working with assigned youths. Every month, each will participate in a major event with two youths (sports, movie, etc.), visit with the youths and their parents, and coordinate with the schools attended by the boys.

2. Additional law enforcement explorer posts will be organized and coordinated, with special training provided youths at the Dallas Police Academy. Participating youths will be involved in special planned activities, such as assisting the Department in promoting existing crime prevention programs.

3. Youthful Impact offenders will be selected from computerized printouts and vigorously recruited into organized recreational activities, such as boxing, baseball, camping, football, etc. Police coaches will also furnish one-on-one counseling and guidance in living skills.

4. A policewoman and female community service worker will work exclusively with female juvenile Impact offenders in the same fashion as above, i.e., building close relationships, recreation (cheerleader team), etc.

Third year activities will consist of a continuation of the above activities, strongly emphasizing thorough evaluation to determine the effect of the project in terms of observed behavior modification and statistical improvement in juvenile Impact crime involvement.

**EVALUATION:**

a. Effectiveness
   (1) Recidivism of participating chronic offenders compared to a control group.
   (2) Offenses known to police committed by participating delinquents compared to juveniles at large.

b. Efficiency
   (1) Number of youths actually participating in each project compared to number projected (one on two at 50; Explorer at 150; Athletics at 800; Female Activities at 20).
   (2) Number of police-delinquent interactions compared to planned 1200 interactions.
   (3) Number of police employees participating compared to the planned 69 projection.

c. Methods of Analysis
   This project will be evaluated monthly with a quarterly synopsis submitted to funding agency. Analysis will include:
   (1) Each one on two program chronic offender will be tracked, both in the experimental and control group, to determine how many are re-arrested. This number will be divided by the total of each group to determine the recidivism rate.
   (2) Each delinquent will be tracked to determine how many commit additional offenses. A total number of offenses known to the police attributable to participating juveniles will be documented and compared to offenses committed by all other delinquents identified in the City.
   (3) The number identified under “Measures of Efficiency” will be tabulated and compared to projected objectives.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$148,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$227,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI-91
IMPACT PROJECT 3.4
YOUTH SERVICES PROGRAM

PROBLEM:

During the year 1972, the Dallas Police Department Youth Division processed 8,226 arrested juveniles of which 5,915 or 71.9 percent were referred to the Juvenile Department. Only 11.8 percent were eventually referred to Juvenile Court. The remainder of those referred were placed on non-judicial probation, transferred to State Juvenile Parole Office (TYC), transferred to other agencies or released to parents with a warning.

Of the 8,226 juveniles arrested in 1972, 1,634 were arrested for committing Impact-related offenses (murder, rape, robbery, assaults, burglary). There were 31,611 Impact-related offenses reported during this period and it is estimated that more than 9,167 were committed by juveniles. There were 5,925 persons officially charged with committing Impact-related offenses. Of this number, 67 percent of 4,425 were adults and 1,500 or 33 percent were juveniles. Furthermore, the juvenile recidivism rate rose from 45.75 percent in 1971 to 46.79 percent in 1972. This high rate is an indication that the current “traditional” approach to handling juveniles is inadequate.

The referral rate to the Juvenile Department is much higher than the national average which is approximately 50 percent. One reason for the high referral rate is that there are no alternatives currently available to the police. The “traditional” method used by the Dallas Police Department in handling juveniles is: Those arrested for a felony, major misdemeanor, or the third arrest for a minor misdemeanor are referred to the Juvenile Department. All others are related to their parents with a warning. An exception may be in a case where safety or protection of the juvenile or the community is needed.

OBJECTIVES:

This project will:

a. Reduce the number of referrals to the Juvenile Department by 10 percent or 590 juveniles during the first 16 months and by 30 percent or 1,770 juveniles by the third year of the project.

b. Reduce juvenile recidivism by 3 percent to 43.79 during the first 16 months and by 10 percent to 36.79 over the three-year project.

c. Reduce the number of Impact related offenses committed by juveniles by 3 percent or 62 during the first 16 months and by 6 percent or 124 over the three-year project.

d. Provide needed service to approximately 3,050 youths who have not been arrested during the first 16 months and 9,150 over the three-year project.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The emphasis of this project will be to provide a wide range of alternatives for police to use in handling juveniles. The rationale for this approach is that the problems of juveniles are multifaceted and that any program which attempts to meaningfully deal with these problems must itself consist of a variety of components. Probably the most innovative aspect of this project is that it is extremely comprehensive; it addressed itself to many of the needs of the juveniles in Dallas. The project stresses positive contacts by police, counseling, education, drug education, recreation, the professional assistance from a Psychiatrist or Psychologist if needed, and the utilization of community resources.

The educational and training needs of a project such as this are extremely extensive. This project will include highly specialized training for personnel responsible for handling juveniles within the department and teach them to help youth develop their living, learning, and working skills.
During the life of the project, several concurrent activities will be pursued, to include:

1. Further training and providing additional time for officers charged with the responsibility for handling children and youth.

2. Providing professional counselors at the police level to devote full time and effort in helping youth and developing meaningful youth programs and services.

3. Organize and utilize an effective community agency referral system for children and youths.

4. Contracting of psychological and psychiatric services to guarantee treatment for children and youths in need of such services.

The third year of the project will be devoted to a continuation of these activities, as well as continued evaluation in order to firmly establish the necessary programs dictated by results. Those programs which are established as effective will be incorporated into regular working procedures, while those proven ineffective will be dropped.

**EVALUATION:**

1. Juvenile recidivism rate, the percent of juveniles arrested who have a previous arrest record.

2. The referral rate to Dallas County Juvenile Department, the percent of juveniles arrested who are referred to the Juvenile Department for disposition. Reducing this rate will allow this agency to exercise more rehabilitation and control over high risk juveniles.

3. The number of juvenile Impact arrests the number of juveniles arrested for committing Impact offenses. This count will be used as a surrogate of the number of offenses committed by juveniles.

4. The number of community agencies secured to assist juveniles with social problems.

5. The number of police officers trained in counseling youthful offenders.

6. The number of youthful offenders receiving services from the project.

7. The number of parents of youthful offenders counseled by project personnel.

8. The number of non-arrested youths provided services by the project.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$835,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 4.0

REDUCE DRUG RELATED STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 3% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Drug Abuse Enforcement Project</td>
<td>$132,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes — Dallas</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Alternatives to Custody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$632,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROBLEM:

The heroin and cocaine supply in the City of Dallas has increased to the degree that a more sophisticated enforcement program designed to devote full time and effort to the control of these drugs is necessary.

The number of heroin addicts in this city has increased from an estimated 500 in 1968 to an estimated 3,000 to 5,000 in 1973. This tremendous increase in demand for illicit drugs has caused a very significant and proportionate increase in the illegal drug supply. The increase in the addiction rate has also caused a very significant increase in the crimes of burglary, thefts, and robberies.

There are no acceptable methods of determining a true percentage of crime that is drug related, however, it is accepted that a very high percentage of these crimes are directly related to drug addiction and overall drug abuse. It is therefore conceivable that as the addiction rate continues to increase, the supply of drugs and crime will also increase.

Cocaine is fast becoming a major problem nationwide. The increase in the abuse and availability of this drug is very noticeable in Dallas. Widespread abuse of this very dangerous drug is evident among young people and it is predicted that the abuse of this drug will continue to increase.

Geographically, Dallas is an ideal location to be used as a distribution point for heroin and cocaine. It is generally accepted by all police agencies in the area that a percentage of drug supply in Dallas is controlled by organized crime, however, the degree of control is unknown. Current drug intelligence gathering techniques have failed to establish this very important factor and this problem must be resolved if this vital area of drug enforcement is to be controlled.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Drug Abuse Project is a three-year effort designed to develop a sophisticated drug intelligence information system, enforcement action against major illicit drug suppliers, and a reduction of the availability of illicit drugs, thus reducing the need to commit stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.

During the life of the project, several concurrent activities will be pursued, to include:

1. A massive undercover program designed to attack major drug suppliers with necessary funds available to buy narcotics for prosecution purposes, pay confidential informants for intelligence information, purchase of non-police type vehicles, and a general fund to pay all other accrued expenses of the program.

2. In order to develop cases and gather drug intelligence against suppliers of drugs, it is essential to have surveillance capabilities.

3. Due to the very nature of drug enforcement and the lack of manpower resources, it is necessary that funds be made available to compensate officers for working overtime so that they will be available 24 hours a day.

The first year of the project was devoted to research into the extent and nature of drug abuse, developing baseline data, and a subsequent definition of Impact programs for the prevention and reduction of drug abuse.

The third year of this project will be devoted to a continuation of these activities, as well as continued evaluation in order to firmly establish the necessary programs dictated by results. Those programs which are established as effective will be incorporated into regular working procedure, while those proven ineffective will be dropped.
Currently, due to a lack of funds and surveillance equipment, it is impossible to penetrate past the street level drug dealer. For these same reasons police have been unable to gather intelligence necessary to keep informed and abreast of the local organized drug suppliers who are connected to organized crime in other parts of the country.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Reduce illegal drug supplies by 5 percent in the first year and 20 percent in three years. Assumption: Initiate a more concentrated and selective enforcement action program against the major suppliers of narcotics and dangerous drugs, thus reducing the availability of illicit drugs.

2. Reduce the increase of drug addiction by 5 percent in the first year and 20 percent in three years. Assumption: The increase in drug addiction is attributed to the fact that the most common cause of addiction is association with addicts and drug availability. Reducing the availability of addicting drugs thereby forcing the addict to seek treatment will have an effect on the spread of addiction.

3. Reduce stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglaries (drug related) by 5 percent in the first year and 20 percent in three years. Assumption: That a large percentage of crime is committed by drug addicts. Reducing the drug supply will force addicts into drug treatment programs, thereby eliminating the need to commit these crimes.

4. Increase drug intelligence capabilities in the areas of organized crime. Assumption: Drug supply is a very lucrative business and is very much a part of organized crime, thus necessitating the facilitation of a drug intelligence information system.

The goal of this project and the Dallas Police Department is to:

1. Reduce the availability of all illicit drugs.
2. Reduce the increase of drug addiction.
3. Reduce the overall drug abuse problem.
4. To force the local drug addicts into a community sponsored drug treatment program.

These activities will contribute to the reduction of stranger-to-stranger crime and burglary in Dallas by:

1. Eliminating local drug addicts' sources of supply thereby forcing addicts into community drug treatment and rehabilitation programs. By reducing the availability of addicting drugs, addicts must seek legal means of supporting their addiction and will have no motive for committing crime in this category.

2. Arrest, prosecution, and confinement of those who deal in illegal drug traffic and are deeply rooted in criminal activity responsible for a percentage of crimes in these categories.

3. Gathering drug and related criminal intelligence necessary to develop criminal cases in these crime categories.

EVALUATION:

As baseline data are developed, before/after comparisons will be made on the following to determine the effectiveness of this project:

1. Statistics on the number of persons arrested for sale of illicit drugs.
2. Statistics on the number of persons arrested for possession of illicit drugs.
3. Quantity of illicit drugs seized.
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4. Intelligence information received on drug availability.
5. Statistics on persons admitted to drug treatment programs.
6. Statistics on the number of illegal possession cases developed against known drug suppliers.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$132,353</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17,647</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$176,500</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

In 1972, a Dallas Grand Jury released a report noting that approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in Dallas are drug related. Burglary and robbery were specifically noted as being crimes committed by narcotic addicts attempting to support their drug habits.

The Dallas Police Department estimates that there are a total of 2,000 heroin addicts in the city. During 1971, 220 cases were filed on persons charged with using heroin and other narcotics (except methadone), while another 450 cases were filed under the heading “dangerous drugs,” which includes methadone, amphetamines, barbiturates and hallucinogens.

The Dallas County Institute of Forensic Sciences, which is the principle criminalistic laboratory used by all law enforcement agencies in the county and which also is the office for the County Medical Examiner, records 22 deaths during 1971 attributable to drugs. Of these, 11 deaths resulted from heroin. For 1972, as of October 31, 26 deaths have been attributed to opiates.

There is presently very little treatment available for those drug addicts who are arrested. As addicts they have become ineligible for most pre-trial release aids and must undergo the effects of their addiction while incarcerated. This creates special health problems for both the city and county jails, particularly the county jail which is the primary holding facility, and which suffers already from a serious overcrowding problem. If an addict happens to be released on bail, he becomes unacceptable to most treatment facilities who generally accept only addicts with no charges pending.

Further, experience has shown that most drug-dependent persons when released on bail or after brief periods of confinement will sooner or later resume their drug-taking behavior, again commit crimes and sooner or later will be re-arrested.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To decrease the incidence of drug related stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary by 10 percent.
2. To provide diversion and treatment for 474 identified opiate addicts.
3. To achieve a 50 percent success rate in the treatment of 474 arrested addicts.
4. To reduce the rate of criminal recidivism among those who successfully complete treatment by 75 percent.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Implementation of this project will focus on the development of a diversion staff and coordination of treatment facilities with the NIMH funded Dallas County Mental Health Mental Retardation — DARCO grant. The diversion staff will be developed to contain a screening director and staff at both the city and county jails, coordinator of treatment and testing facilities (contracted), and a director and staff responsible for monitoring and transporting program participants.

The basic alternative forms of treatment available will be residential treatment services, outpatient counseling, methadone withdrawal, methadone maintenance, and medical services.

The treatment services will continue as long as determined by the drug treatment director. Should the arrestee withdraw from the treatment program, he will be subject to the same conditions as if he had violated conditions of bail.
Simultaneously with the treatment process, the adjudication process will continue and the treatment program will not necessarily have any direct impact on the adjudication procedures. In effect, before, during, and after adjudication, continuance of the treatment services are at the discretion of the court.

**EVALUATION:**

Evaluation will be based on:

1. Number of persons screened and accepted into treatment program.

2. Number of persons completing all of treatment program.

3. Number of persons arrested while in treatment program.

4. Comparison of repeat offenses committed by program participants to similar group not admitted to program.

5. Number of persons who continue treatment program after adjudication.

6. Number of persons who continue treatment who are removed from adjudication process prior to formal trial.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>166,666</td>
<td>166,667</td>
<td>333,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$666,666</td>
<td>$666,667</td>
<td>$1,333,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL 5.0

REDUCE STRANGER-TO-STRANGER CRIMES AND BURGLARY COMMITTED BY REPEAT OFFENDERS IN THE CITY OF DALLAS BY 5% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Increase Adult Probation Department</td>
<td>$1,105,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Pre-Trial Release and Diversion</td>
<td>270,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Halfway House for Ex-Offenders</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Word Processing Center for the District Attorney's Office</td>
<td>26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Create Two Temporary District Courts</td>
<td>818,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Prosecutor's Training Program</td>
<td>49,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Book-In Unit for Dallas County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>198,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Legal Aides for Police</td>
<td>160,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,666,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

At the close of 1972, there were 6,867 felony probationers in Dallas County who were wards of the seven Criminal District Courts. Approximately 85 percent of all these felony probationers are Impact Offenders. During 1972, there were 24 probation officers who were assigned an average probationer load of 283. Dallas County's average probation officer's caseload far exceeds the 75 or less recommended by Article 42.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedures. As a result, Dallas County probation personnel have little time to spend with each probationer in their supervision. Practically no time is available to secure the probationer employment, or to visit the probationer on the job, at home, or in the probation office. Probation service has become a function of pre-sentence investigation without adequate opportunity to follow through on cases.

It is anticipated that with an increased emphasis on the reduction of stranger-to-stranger crime and burglary by the Impact Program, the increase of the Adult Probation Office caseload will be approximately five percent, or 425 probationers, the first year.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To reduce caseloads from 290 to 178 by December 31, 1973, to 155 by December 31, 1974, and maintain that level in 1975.
2. To provide a minimum of 120 employment interviews and referrals to prospective employers each month, and to secure placements for a minimum of 20 each month.
3. To enlist a minimum of 100 volunteer Probation Officers who will be assigned on a one-to-one basis, to work with probated adult felons outside the Adult Probation Office by December 31, 1973.
4. To refer a minimum of 10 probationers each month to community counseling programs (Alcoholics Anonymous, Mental Health, Mental Retardation, etc.)
5. To provide psychological testing during pre-sentence investigation for all Impact Offenders by December 31, 1973.
6. To remove known repeat offender probationers from the community by aid of the Regional Adult Probation Computer System.
7. To establish training curricula and schedules in order to provide an average of 10 hours of in-service training for each Probation Officer by December 31, 1973, and 20 hours by December 31, 1974.
8. To provide computer-prepared reports to Probation Officers to assist them in identifying "high-risk" probationers.

IMPLEMENTATION:

During the first year of the project, all anticipated staffing has been completed. This includes 30 Probation Officers, 15 supportive staff (clerical), an Employment Specialist, a Coordinator of Volunteer Services, a Community Resources Specialist, a Staff Psychologist, and a Director of Personnel and Training.

Caseloads have been reduced from 290 to 80 — 125 per officer. In addition, all prospective Impact probationers are being screened by the Staff Psychologist. All new probation officers have begun and/or have completed in-service training. Also, the Employment Specialist and the Community Resources Specialist have reached the projected levels of operations. To date, the Coordinator of Volunteer Services has begun to screen applicants for prospective volunteer Probation Officers.
During the second year, an additional 21 employees are to be hired, with nine employees projected to be hired in the third year. Also, two additional Employment Specialists are planned for during the second year, if proved feasible.

The second and third year of the project will be devoted to the further reduction of Probation Officer caseloads, increased rehabilitative efforts in areas begun the first year, and to the making of whatever changes are dictated by first year evaluation. It is anticipated that additional new and innovative projects will be implemented, and that ineffective projects, if any, will be dropped.

EVALUATION:

I. Performance Measures
   Overall Project
   1. Percent of probation revocation.
   2. Percent on probation for drug abuse.
   3. Percent of probation failure this quarter.
   4. Percent of special program dropouts.
   5. Percent probationers rearrested (recidivism).
   6. Rehabilitation indicator.
   7. Cost per probationer.
   8. Percent of probationers on probation for Impact crimes.

II. Volunteer Program
    1. Percent of revocation for persons in volunteer program.
    2. Percent of probation failure for persons enrolled in volunteer program.
    3. Percent of volunteer program dropouts.
    4. Cost per volunteer.
    5. Percent of Impact offenders in volunteer program.

III. Pre-Sentence Psychological Testing
     1. Percent of revocation for persons in psychological testing program.
     2. Percent probation failure for persons enrolled in psychological testing program.
     3. Cost per psychologist test administered.
     4. Percent Impact probationers administered psychological tests.

IV. Employment Program
    1. Percent revocation for persons in employment program.
    2. Percent probation failure for persons in employment program.
    3. Percent of employment program dropouts.
    4. Cost per job placement.
    5. Percent of Impact offenders placed by employment program.
V. Community Resources Program

1. Percent revocation for persons in community resources program.
2. Percent probation failure for persons in community resources program.
3. Percent community resource program dropouts.
4. Cost per referral to community agency.
5. Percent of Impact offenders in community resource program.

VI. Training and Manpower

1. Cost per manhour of training.
2. Average caseload per officer (excluding transfers.)
3. Average caseload per transfer officer.

VII. Crime Seriousness Index

This index is an indicator of the relative severity of crimes for which people are placed on probation in Dallas County, utilizing a point system which assigns factors to be multiplied by the number of crimes of different types to produce an aggregate of crime seriousness points divided by the total number of probationers produces a crime seriousness index.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>$1,105,250</td>
<td>$1,347,500</td>
<td>$2,452,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>386,417</td>
<td>449,167</td>
<td>817,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,473,667</td>
<td>$1,796,667</td>
<td>$3,270,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

The Repeat Offender Study of the Dallas Police Department shows that due to the crowded court dockets and the commercial bond system many offenders awaiting trial commit additional crimes. Inasmuch as many offenders originally committed criminal acts to obtain money, once they are caught up in the criminal justice system they must turn to further crime in order to pay for bonds, attorneys’ fees, etc. Pre-Trial Release is currently ameliorating the above problem in a select number of cases, but due to a lack of adequate staff and diversion alternatives for conditional release many first offenders and those with minor prior records must be passed over. Also, many offenders released under the Pre-Trial program eventually return to crime due to lack of vocational skills, jobs, family problems, and other personal problems. Many who are released by means other than Pre-Trial Release are committing stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary in order to pay the high cost of remaining out of jail.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To reduce repeat offenses committed by persons awaiting trial by 10 percent.
2. To provide personal and vocational counseling to participants in the diversion program.
3. To increase the rate of appearance at trial of persons released on bond.
4. To reduce the number of prisoners awaiting trial in the County Jail.
5. To reduce the cost of maintaining prisoners awaiting trial.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Pre-Trial Release and Diversion Project is designed to increase the rehabilitative effectiveness of the current program. Under the current program the offender may receive rehabilitative effects only pursuant to the fact that he does not have to pay a fee to be released from jail and he is therefore not subject to pre-trial detention before he has been adjudged guilty or innocent. The proposed project will allow the offender to volunteer for various programs and services which will be designed to increase his self-reliance and divert him back into society as a productive law abiding citizen.

Although the programs developed as a part of this project will be available on a voluntary basis to all offenders released on pre-trial release, the staff will concentrate their efforts on those prisoners held for committing Impact crimes who are now either considered marginal risks for release or are now totally excluded. Once a marginal or formerly excluded offender volunteers for a program offered by the project, the court may make participation a condition of his release.

Full implementation of this project will include:

1. The hiring of an Intake Coordinator to aid the current interviewing staff in diverting offenders into the program. The intake coordinator will work closely with the Pre-Trial Release interviewers and aid them in diverting certain offenders into the project.
2. An employment coordinator will aid in securing employment for those people in the project, and act as liaison with the Texas Employment Commission and other community based agencies and employers.
3. An education coordinator will aid the defendant when additional schooling is indicated as a need. The education coordinator will also maintain contact with available schools and training programs in the area.
4. A staff psychologist will be employed to administer tests and counsel the offender in an effort to determine the most appropriate means to deal with his particular deficiency. The staff psychologist will act as a counselor where needed but will basically be responsible for accurate problem definition and remedial referral.

5. Four counselors will be available to deal directly with each project participant. Counselors will be assisted by each of the coordinators and the psychologist when appropriate. However, basic responsibility for each participant's progress will rest with the counselor.

6. A staff including the following employees will be maintained in the Pre-Trial Release portion of the project: Director, Assistant Director, three interviewers, two secretaries, two bond forfeiture investigators, and ten part-time interviewers.

EVALUATION:
Criteria for project evaluation will include:
1. Percent of bond forfeitures
2. Percent on bond for Impact crimes
3. Percent of no shows
4. Percent of recidivism for diversion participants
5. Percent of recidivism for Impact offender in diversion program
6. Percent of diversion program dropouts
7. Cost per defendant
8. Percent of Impact crimes on bond
9. Salary earned while in diversion program
10. Dispositions of program participants
11. Number of days defendant on personal bond and savings to the county

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEAA (Part E)</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$270,285</td>
<td>$298,246</td>
<td>$568,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90,096</td>
<td>99,415</td>
<td>189,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$360,381</td>
<td>$397,661</td>
<td>$748,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

The Dallas Police Department noted in its Repeat Offender Study that the repeat offender is responsible for almost one-half of all index crimes committed in Dallas in 1971. More specifically, 70 percent of persons charged with burglary were repeat offenders, as were 64.5 percent of the persons arrested for robbery.

While conducting a crime analysis for the annual Criminal Justice Plan for Dallas, it was also noted that almost 38 percent of all inmates in the Texas Department of Corrections sentenced from Dallas County had at least one prior prison confinement in Texas. Burglary offenders in this group had the highest recidivism rates, with over 46 percent having served prior Texas prison sentences. A noticeable disparity between prior prison sentences, however, was noted between persons paroled and discharged (served all sentence) to Dallas in 1972. Of the 701 inmates paroled to Dallas in 1972, 154 (21.97 percent) had prior prison sentences. In the discharge category, however, 247 (36.21 percent) of the 682 inmates had served prior Texas prison sentences.

In short, the reasons for the above disparity is two-fold. First, the parolee is selected because of his better background (relative to those discharged). The parolee has fewer and less severe charges than does the dischargee. The second and major factor, however, is the future for the parolee versus the dischargee. Parolees must have someone and something to go to in the community before he is released from the institution. Housing, a job, and supervision all await the parolee. The dischargee, on the other hand, has a much worse criminal background and generally has no family, job, or supervision awaiting him when he steps off the bus in downtown Dallas. He is released from TDC with a bus ticket to Dallas, the clothes he is wearing, and $50. With today's prices in mind, there is no need to elaborate on how long $50 will last a person with no housing, family, food, clothing or job.

From this brief background, it is all too obvious that there is a need for services to which the dischargee can turn to when he hits the streets of Dallas. Services needed include immediate housing, food, clothing, job opportunities, and counseling to help reintegrate him into the community. Without these necessities, statistics tell us that we will see him again in the criminal justice system.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To reduce repeat offenses committed by 90 resident ex-offenders by 50%.
2. To provide short term residential facilities for 90 ex-offenders.
3. To provide job placements for 90 ex-offenders.
4. To provide counseling services and referrals to community resources for 90 ex-offenders.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The facility proposed for Dallas is a 15 to 20 bed house and is to be under the management of a professional director. In addition, two ex-offenders will serve as additional treatment staff.

The building required for this program will preferably be a large, older house with many rooms which can be used to accommodate 15 to 20 residents. The house must be located in a fringe or transition area so that members of all ethnic groups can be reached. In addition, good public transportation must be close at hand. Recreational facilities, such as gyms, theatres, etc., must be nearby. Meals are to be prepared and served in the facility to avoid the institutional conditions simulated in facilities using nearby cafeterias and meal ticket programs. The rehabilitation program will include group and individual counseling, job development and placement,
relocation, etc. In addition, existing community resources such as Texas Rehabilitation Commission, Alcoholics Anonymous, Texas Employment Commission, etc., will be utilized to the fullest extent. Residents of the facility who are employed will be required to pay a set room and board fee ($25.00 per week) and to save a set percentage of their income in preparation of their release.

**EVALUATION:**

1. Number of residents served by facility.
2. Average length of stay of residents.
3. Income earned while in facility.
4. Number of job placements.
5. Number of offenses committed by residents.
6. Number of residents served by counseling program.
7. Number of residents referred to community service agencies.
8. Number of requests for admittance into facility.
9. Number of requests for admittance into facility denied for lack of space.
10. Comparison of resident ex-offenders vs. non-resident ex-offenders.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT PROJECT 5.4
WORD PROCESSING CENTER FOR THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE

PROBLEM:

Many persons who commit stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary become repeat offenders because of excessive delays in bringing them to trial. In 1972 the average time from arrest to trial for a felon in Dallas County was 270 days. Most offenders are released on bond during this period, and many of these continue to pursue their criminal activity while on release. Delays in the judicial process are caused by a number of factors: insufficient number of courts (which already have an excessive backlog of pending cases), inadequate facilities in the Dallas Criminalistics Laboratory and a resultant delay in reporting the results of laboratory analyses, inadequate training of police personnel in the collection and preservation of evidence, excessive workloads in the District Clerk’s and Sheriff’s Offices, and a lack of sufficient modern techniques and equipment in the District Attorney’s Office which slows the preparation of cases and results in an inefficient duplication of effort in many areas.

During 1972, approximately 12,000 persons were indicted by the Dallas County Grand Jury. After indictment the District Attorney’s staff must answer inquiries, update and maintain records, write letters to witnesses, type motions and motions to dismiss, keep memos and computer correspondence records, investigate reports, pick up notifications, files, dockets, etc. Clerical bottlenecks are often created by all of these duties. Currently, a time and motion study is being conducted to determine how much time is spent for clerical functions both by clerical and professional personnel in the District Attorney’s Office.

In the past, 20 percent of all indictments had to be redrawn due to clerical errors. This project is designed to reduce clerical bottlenecks and will lead to speedier trials and more efficient use of professional personnel.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Reduce the time necessary for preparation of legal documents for use in all stages of prosecution, including complaint preparation, indictment preparation, trial motions, legal correspondence, and post conviction documents. This reduction in time is expected to provide for a 24-hour turnaround time of all routine documents within 12 months.
2. Reduce attorney’s time spent in document preparation by 25 percent within 24 months.

IMPLEMENTATION:

This project provides for the elimination of the duplication of effort and a 50 percent reduction in time required for writing, transcribing, typing, proofing, and re-typing of approximately 75 percent of the correspondence, orders, and other documents prepared by the District Attorney’s Office. The result is a more efficient day-to-day operation which relieves prosecutors of many clerical duties and allows them to spend more time in Impact case preparation and in the courtroom. Overall, this project is expected to reduce the time from indictment to trial of Impact offenders by ten days within two years.

The word processing center provides for the magnetic storage of several hundred often-used legal documents and a central recording center to which attorneys dictate (over the internal telephone system) the variable items (e.g., defendant’s name, address, charge, etc.) to be used in typing the form. Typists receive the dictation and enter these variables into the automatic typewriter which then types out the finished document at 14.5 characters per second. This system eliminates long-hand drafts, shorthand recording, transcription, and typing errors. Based on the experience of the Bexar County District Attorney’s Office, it is expected that a normal turnaround time of 24 hours can be expected for routine documents, and minutes for high priority items. Specific emphasis of the project will be toward providing the District Attorney’s Office support in handling stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.
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**EVALUATION:**

The Word Processing Center will be evaluated in terms of the following:

1. Reduction in turn-around time of legal documents (quarterly).
2. Reduction in manhours of attorney's time spent in document preparation. (quarterly)
3. Subjective evaluation by the Dallas County District Attorney as to the increased efficiency of his office. (quarterly)
4. Subjective evaluation of the system by personnel from other District Attorney's Offices, selected by the Texas Criminal Justice Council.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT PROJECT 5.5
CREATE TWO TEMPORARY DISTRICT COURTS

PROBLEM:

This project attacks a problem of an overloaded court system. The sheer volume of cases introduced into the Criminal District Courts has increased the backlog of cases awaiting trial and/or appeal. The seven Dallas Criminal District Courts had a combined case backlog, as of December 31, 1972, of approximately 12,000 cases including unapprehendeds. Of these around 9,000 cases were Impact or Impact related.

Statistics reported by the Dallas Police Department indicate that approximately 14,074 Police Department cases were considered by the Dallas County Grand Jury in calendar year 1972. This figure represented 90 percent of all cases heard by the Grand Jury.

The Dallas Police Department's Repeat Offender Study indicates that in the event an offender has committed multiple offenses, cases should be filed on him for all offenses. Since this has not been the practice in the past, the result of this policy will be to greatly increase the number of cases filed with the District Attorney's Office, which will lead to an increase in the number of Impact cases filed.

During 1972, the following crimes were committed in Dallas: 208 murders, 588 rapes, 2,780 robberies, 5,409 assaults, and 25,419 burglaries. If aggravated assault is subtracted (less than 10 percent of aggravated assaults occurring in the City of Dallas are stranger-to-stranger), then there were approximately 28,995 Impact crimes in 1972. Although the Impact programs of the Dallas Police Department should reduce the incidence of Impact Crime, a policy of filing multiple cases against offenders will create a greater load of Impact cases for the Criminal District Courts of Dallas.

OBJECTIVES:

This project will:
1. Provide swifter justice by reducing the elapsed time between filing and disposition of felony cases by October, 1973, from the present average of 271 days to 180 days, and to reduce this time to 90 days by October, 1975.
2. Reduce the number of repeat Impact offenses by persons on release while awaiting trial. Repeat offender crime rate in Dallas County should be reduced by 25 percent.
3. Reduce the average length of stay of Impact inmates in the county jail with a resultant decrease in the jail population by 10 percent.
4. Reduce the case backlog from the present 4,600 (apprehended) to 2,700 in three years. This 2,700 would represent the number of persons awaiting trial if disposition were reduced to 90 days from date of filing to trial disposition date. The capability to hold more jury trials, provided by two new courts, will aid in the reduction of this backlog.
5. Reduce the elapsed time between trial and finality of appeal. In conjunction with other Impact projects, such as providing legal assistance to the police, better charge and trial preparation will result and in the long run there should be fewer appeals to higher courts.
6. Expand the existing computerized data base to provide operational data required for the additional courts and provide for tracking of Impact cases through the criminal justice system — from book-in through final disposition.
7. Provide for more efficient coordination of activities in the District Attorney’s Office and between that office and the courts.
IMPLEMENTATION:

This project will be a three-year project designed to increase prosecution of stranger-to-stranger offenders and to strengthen the entire Dallas County criminal justice system by providing two temporary district courts.

During the first year of funding, staffing for the two temporary courts was commensurate with the staffing for the seven existing District Courts. The court personnel include two Court Reporters, six Prosecuting Attorneys, two Appellate Attorneys, three Trial and Appeals Secretaries, one Complaint Secretary, one Grand Jury Attorney, two Justice of the Peace Attorneys, three Record Clerks, one Administrative Manager, nine Deputy District Clerks, four Bailiffs, four Warrant Deputies and Clerks, six Bond Deputies and Clerks, and two Identification Section Deputies. These persons were promoted, where possible, from within the offices of the District Attorney, Sheriff, and District Clerk; the remainder of the required personnel were hired. Staffing took place when the two new courts were put into operation. The chief Prosecutors for the new courts are experienced and were moved into the newly created positions. Number Two Prosecutors were promoted into vacant Chief Prosecutor positions; Number Three Prosecutors promoted into vacant Two Positions, and Number Three Prosecutor positions were filled by promoting from Misdemeanor Courts.

Expansion of the existing data base, in order to provide tracking of Impact cases through the criminal justice system and generate statistical data upon which to evaluate the success of this project, will require the modification of some 208 existing computer programs. Data conversion for the two new courts will require a concentrated effort, both clerical and keypunch.

At the time of the offense (or subsequent investigation), the officer taking the complaint will indicate that this was an Impact crime. When the subject is arrested and booked into the Dallas County Jail, his computerized record will be flagged as an Impact record. The remainder of his record will follow established format and will be included on the files along with all other records. This will provide for the extracting and/or summarizing of statistical records of all cases, or Impact and non-Impact cases separately. Statistics showing length of time from case filing to disposition and from notice of appeal to finality of appeal will be generated by this system, as will data concerning case backlog. These data will form the basis upon which to measure the effectiveness of these two temporary district courts.

EVALUATION:

This project will be measured quarterly in terms of the following items:

1. Recidivism (re-arrest) rate of persons released on bond.
2. Average time between filing and disposition of cases.
3. Average time between trial and final appeal of cases.
4. Backlog of cases pending.
5. Average number of days inmates are held in the county jail.
6. Number of case dispositions in each temporary court.
7. Average cost per case disposed of in each court. (Cost will be based on the salaries and expenses of each person associated with the two temporary courts.)

Note: All of the above measures will be calculated separately for Impact and non-Impact cases.

Quarterly evaluation reports will reflect the changes occurring as a result of the project’s activities through the three-year grant period. Narrative documentation will further explain project circumstances surrounding project achievements.
In addition, external evaluation of this project will be conducted by a team selected for its expertise in the concept of the project.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>$ 818,824</td>
<td>$ 855,882</td>
<td>$1,164,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>109,176</td>
<td>114,118</td>
<td>223,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>163,765</td>
<td>171,176</td>
<td>334,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,091,765</td>
<td>$1,141,176</td>
<td>$2,232,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:
There is a need to educate Dallas Assistant District Attorneys, Dallas Police Officers, Dallas County Deputy Sheriffs in the techniques and skills required for capable and efficient criminal prosecution and the administration of the new Penal Code and the prosecution of stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.

By improving case presentation, the quality of charges filed, the quality of prosecution and familiarizing criminal justice personnel with the new Penal Code and Impact crimes, this project seeks to help speed Impact cases through the criminal justice system. By means of increased training, criminal justice personnel will strengthen their abilities to respond more effectively to stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary through improved case preparation and prosecution.

OBJECTIVES:
1. Improve the effectiveness of the District Attorney's Prosecution staff in handling Impact cases by providing 2,000 manhours of training in one year. This will also include in-trial training for the prosecution staff.
2. Provide law enforcement personnel from both Dallas County Sheriff's Office and the Dallas Police Department 3400 manhours of training closely related to their work and the effective prosecution of stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary.
3. Assist in speeding up the Courts' processing of Impact cases through increased training and familiarity with the new Penal Code by increased training of Dallas criminal justice system personnel.

IMPLEMENTATION:
The formal prosecution course is to be accomplished during four full-day sessions every six months or 56 hours of training annually. Experienced prosecutors, judges, and other qualified personnel will deliver lectures concerning basic prosecution techniques and the new Penal Code. Approximately twenty of the top prosecutors in the Dallas County District Attorney's Office and the Director of Training will participate in instruction for the project. In addition to these instructors, other instructors will be selected from District Attorney's Offices through the State. Judges from the criminal courts of Dallas County will also provide material and instruction for the project.

Curriculum for the Dallas prosecutors and law enforcement personnel will include lectures on: the new Penal Code, aggravated assault trials, rape and statutory rape trials, burglary trials, murder trials, robbery trials, and prior convictions—used for enhancement of a case. These lectures will cover effective prosecution, presentation of evidence, and methods of collecting and preserving evidence at the scene of the crime.

Through increasing the training of law enforcement personnel in Dallas, this project seeks to improve governmental capability to respond to Impact crimes. Curriculum in the Prosecutor's Training Program will concentrate on Impact crime trials, the gathering of evidence for Impact crimes, and the preservation of the evidence for courtroom preservation.

EVALUATION:
The Prosecutors Training Program will be evaluated in terms of the following measurements:
1. Total number of manhours spent in training Dallas criminal justice system personnel.
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2. Total number of manhours spent in training the following categories of Dallas criminal justice system personnel:
   a. District Attorney's Prosecution Staff
   b. Judges
   c. Dallas Police Officers
   d. Dallas County Deputy Sheriffs

3. Both the reduction in elapsed time between indictment and disposition and the reduction in excess case backlog will provide an indirect measurement of the project.

4. Additionally, a subjective evaluation will be conducted by an evaluation team and a questionnaire addressing the quality of the training program and value to attending personnel will be filled out by all persons attending.

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$49,765</td>
<td>$52,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$6,635</td>
<td>$6,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$9,953</td>
<td>$10,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$66,353</td>
<td>$69,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROBLEM:

At the present time, all persons are booked into and out of the Dallas County Jail at a central location. The jail admissions work-load averages in excess of 225 persons per day; the average number of releases is approximately the same. Each individual booked into the jail requires approximately four hours of processing time.

Persons booked-in and released through this one location include individuals convicted and placed on probation, individuals who are going through pre-sentence investigation, persons arrested "off the streets", and prisoners transferred from other agencies.

In addition to the work involved in booking individuals into and out of the jail, the personnel in this section aid probation officers in pre-probation investigation. Book-in assistance in pre-probation investigation requires book-in personnel to spend four hours on each of the investigations. Book-in personnel are also responsible for transporting and recording all persons going to and from the nine Criminal District Courts, and the six County Criminal Courts. It is not unusual for book-in personnel to transport 150 prisoners to these Courts during any given day. All dispositions received from the Courts must also be transferred to the custody records by the Book-In personnel.

Under the current procedure, all persons waiting to be booked-in or released are mixed together, which represents a severe security risk in the form of escape or transport of contraband.

The book-in/out situation creates a serious bottleneck in prisoner processing. This problem has worsened recently, due to increased police activity, case dispositions, and probation investigations due to Impact projects established by the Dallas Police Department, the Dallas County Criminal District Courts, and the Dallas County Probation Department. It is also anticipated that with the passage of the new Penal Code (which made theft under $200 a misdemeanor), and the reform of marijuana laws, an increase will occur in the number of persons booked into the jail for misdemeanors. This is projected to increase the average daily jail population from 1,600 to 2,200.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Provide a more efficient operation of the Dallas County Jail by eliminating the bottle-neck in prisoner processing at book-in. Average book-in time should be reduced from four hours to two hours.
   Assumption: The separation of the book-in functions will greatly increase efficiency in prisoner processing.

2. Increase security in the Dallas County Jail during processing of Impact offenders into and out of the jail.

3. Effect a shortened time period for pre-probation investigations of Impact offenders. The average time necessary to conduct a pre-probation investigation should be reduced 50%, from four hours to two hours.

IMPLEMENTATION:

This project will establish a second book-in station, and provide staffing for it. This station will be located on the ground floor of the Dallas County Jail and will be used to process persons "arrested off-the-street" and transferred from the City Jail. The present book-in station (located on the seventh floor) will be used to process out prisoners already housed in the jail, and to
transport prisoners to and from the courts. Separating the two functions will enhance jail security and enable the Sheriff's Department to process the increased prisoner load generated by the Dallas Impact Program.

The steps that will be taken to implement this project are as follows:

1. Hire one Lieutenant, two Book-In Officers, eight Terminal Book-In Clerks, two Sergeants, and four Correctional Officers.
2. Construct counters and facilities for the Book-In Station.
3. Purchase equipment necessary to operate the station.

**Evaluation:**

This project will be measured quarterly in terms of the following measurements:

1. Reduction in the average time necessary to process Impact Offenders at book-in.
   This will be calculated utilizing:
   a. The number of Impact Offenders booked-in quarterly.
   b. The average time necessary to process the Impact Offenders.

2. The average time necessary to book-out an Impact offender.
   The following will be utilized:
   a. The number of Impact offenders booked-out.
   b. Total man-hours expended quarterly on book-out.

3. Total prisoners booked-in and booked-out of jail (both Impact and Non-Impact.)

4. Reduction in the average time necessary to conduct an Impact pre-probation investigation.
   This will be calculated using:
   a. Total number of pre-probation investigations calculated.
   b. Average time necessary to conduct pre-probation investigation.

5. Average time expended per prisoner transporting the prisoner to and from court.
   This measurement will be calculated using:
   a. Total man-hours expended transporting prisoners to and from court.
   b. Total number of prisoners transported to and from court.

**Budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part E)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$198,350</td>
<td>$208,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66,117</td>
<td>69,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$264,467</td>
<td>$277,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM:

Effective prosecution is currently being reduced by failure of the enforcement personnel of the Dallas Police Department to efficiently investigate crime and to properly report the results of their investigative efforts to the Dallas County District Attorney's Office.

The present ineffectiveness in investigation and reporting can be demonstrated by the following:

1. The Dallas County Grand Jury is returning “no-bills” or failing to indict in approximately 30 percent of all felony cases filed by the Dallas Police Department. This figure is based on no bill action on 3,657 cases of approximately 12,600 total cases submitted by the Dallas Police Department to the Dallas County Grand Jury.

2. The Courts and the District Attorney’s Office are dismissing slightly over 18 percent of all Part I offense cases after indictment and 13.26 percent of all cases indicted or filed in the County Courts on a complaint information process. The County Court Disposition Report shows that 4,214 Part I Index offenses disposed of by the felony courts of Dallas County 1,101 Index offenses or 18.1 percent were dismissed following indictment but prior to or during prosecution. The overall dismissed rate for the 14,825 cases filed in the county courts during 1971 was 1,991 or 13.26 percent.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Reduction of the Dallas County Grand Jury’s “no bill action” in stranger-to-stranger crimes from the current rate of 30 percent to a figure of 20 percent. Assumption: With the assistance of the attorneys on legal matters, the likelihood of a true bill increases.

2. Reduction of the dismissals after indictment from 18 percent to 12 percent during the life span of the project. Assumption: With closer coordination and cooperation with the District Attorney’s Office, a higher prosecution rate will be obtained.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The Legal Aides to Police Project is a three-year program designed to increase the effectiveness of the Dallas Police Department in the prevention, detection, and prosecution of stranger-to-stranger crimes. This primary goal will be attained by the following activities:

1. Interfacing the police function more effectively with other agencies in the criminal justice system (specifically the Office of the District Attorney). Programs have been developed to improve coordination and cooperation in case preparation and prosecution.

2. Reduction of Impact crimes by legal aid and advice to enforcement personnel. Specific actions that are involved in these two activities are:

   Assignment of one attorney to the Patrol Bureau and one attorney to the investigative divisions, closer coordination with the court liaison unit, careful evaluation of all stranger-to-stranger crime cases before filing, review of all “no bill action” by the Grand Jury, and all dismissals by the courts after indictment. One attorney serves as program coordinator and develops programs to improve coordination and cooperation in case preparation and prosecution with the Dallas County District Attorney’s Office. One attorney has been assigned to the Southeast Division of the Patrol Bureau. Existing policies, procedures and training programs will continue to be closely monitored as they relate to the project. One attorney will be assigned to assist the coordinating attorney and other attorneys as required. Emphasis will continue to be placed on the development of innovative procedures such as legal technicians to assist the attorneys in the project and improved effectiveness in training and line supervision as it relates to the project.
EVALUATION:

1. Evaluation Measures — The Legal Aide Project will be evaluated in terms of the following measurements:
   - Total cases reviewed.
   - Total cases returned for additional investigation.
   - Total supplemental cases reviewed.
   - Total reduced to misdemeanor or municipal court charge.
   - Total changed to Grand Jury referral.
   - Total cases “washed out” no case.
   - Total number of no bills reviewed.
   - Total number of cases re-submitted to Grand Jury.
   - Total number of dismissals reviewed.
   - Total number of hours training per officer enrolled.

2. In addition, the project will utilize the following methods of analysis:
   - Comparison of the true-bill rate to the last quarter and same period last year.
   - An analysis of the reasons for no-bills.
   - An analysis of the case resubmission success rate.
   - An analysis of the reasons for case dismissals.
   - Documentation of conclusions and recommendations.

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAA (Part C)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contribution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$160,589</td>
<td>$168,353</td>
<td>$328,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,411</td>
<td>22,447</td>
<td>43,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60,667</td>
<td>63,600</td>
<td>124,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$242,667</td>
<td>$254,400</td>
<td>$497,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>LEAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Incentive for Dallas Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite Police/Community Services Program</td>
<td>38,760</td>
<td>50,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Town House (Dallas County)</td>
<td>37,839</td>
<td>50,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Legal Assistance to Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>21,250</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention — Education Unit — Garland</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>41,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Legal Support to Dallas County Criminal District and County Criminal Courts</td>
<td>346,375</td>
<td>407,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Specialized Crime Division — Dallas Co.</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of In-Service Training and Education Program — Dallas County</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>58,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitative Library Program — Dallas County Jail</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Rehabilitation for Dallas County Inmates</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Communications Control Equipment Services — Dallas County</td>
<td>213,000</td>
<td>258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,071,799</td>
<td>$1,307,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DALLAS AREA ANNUAL ACTION PROGRAM BUDGET

GOAL I: REDUCE INDEX CRIMES IN DALLAS BY 40% IN FIVE YEARS.
CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL I-1: REDUCE CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY BY 15% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>LEAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems Integration — DPD</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,411,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County Law Enforcement Assistance System</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Investigative Unit — Dallas County</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Crime Monitoring — DPD</td>
<td>337,137</td>
<td>397,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Vehicle Identification Handbook — DPD</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>41,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Reporter Unit — Grand Prairie</td>
<td>31,705</td>
<td>37,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Tactical Unit — Garland</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>125,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Crime Seizing — Garland</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>25,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Implementation of Police Information System Inspection — Garland</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>47,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Apprehension of a Lawbreaker by a Copter at Night — Mesquite</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>32,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Recovered Stolen Property — DPD</td>
<td>18,136</td>
<td>21,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Management Study — Mesquite</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impounded Motor Vehicle Inspection Unit — DPD</td>
<td>123,354</td>
<td>145,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Scene Search — Dallas County Sheriff</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL I-1 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,906,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,419,194</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL I-2: REDUCE INDEX CRIMES BY 10% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>LEAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bomb Disposal Unit — Dallas County</td>
<td>$ 72,250</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Retrieval System — Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>191,250</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handie Talkie Receiver — DPD</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>19,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingerprint and Mug Shot Search — Mesquite</td>
<td>41,650</td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Research and Planning — Mesquite</td>
<td>10,455</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Cadet — Garland</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>56,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Program — Garland</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>44,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor's Aide/Legal Assistant — Garland</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Law Enforcement through Technical Equipment — Garland</td>
<td>23,545</td>
<td>27,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Management and Organizational Improvements — Garland</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>37,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Legal Advisor — Mesquite</td>
<td>23,624</td>
<td>27,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL I-2 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 527,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 620,878</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL I TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,433,886</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,039,872</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL II: REDUCE CRIMES COMMITTED BY REPEAT OFFENDERS BY 50% IN FIVE YEARS.
CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL II-1: REDUCE INDEX CRIMES COMMITTED BY 20% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>LEAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision and Expansion of Juvenile Section — Dallas County</td>
<td>$ 63,750</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL II-1 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 63,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 75,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL II-2: REDUCE MISDEMEANORS BY REPEAT OFFENDERS BY 10% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of &quot;Style of Case Index&quot; — Dallas County</td>
<td>$ 26,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Information System for County Courts — Dallas County</td>
<td>70,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of Information and Communications System — Dallas County</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Steelwork of Dallas County Jail</td>
<td>487,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL II-2 TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 923,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL II TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 987,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL III: REDUCE DRUG ABUSE AND ORGANIZED CRIME ACTIVITY BY 30% IN ONE YEAR.

CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL III-1: REDUCE DRUG RELATED CRIMES BY 20% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canine Corp — Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>$ 8,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Expanded Narcotics Squad in Grand Prairie Police Department</td>
<td>15,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Youth Services Unit — Garland</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Police Photo Lab Equipment — Mesquite</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL III-1 TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 68,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL III-2: REDUCE THE INCIDENCE OF ORGANIZED CRIME ACTIVITY BY 10% IN ONE YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness of Organized Crime — DPD</td>
<td>$ 46,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL III-2 TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 46,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL III TOTAL</td>
<td>$115,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL IV: STRENGTHEN DALLAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM COMMUNITY RELATIONS.

CRIME-ORIENTED GOAL IV-1: STRENGTHEN POLICE DEPARTMENT COMMUNITY RELATIONS TO THE EXTENT THAT NO MAJOR CIVIL DISORDER OCCURS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearms Judgement and Recognition Training — DPD</td>
<td>$ 29,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Administrative Advanced Management Workshop — DPD</td>
<td>6,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL IV TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 35,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL ACTION PROGRAM TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,571,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (INCLUDING CONTINUATION)</td>
<td>$5,643,726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### IMPACT PROJECTS
#### BUDGET SUMMARY
(Federal Share Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Reduce Burglary in the City of Dallas by 8% in one year.</th>
<th>1st Year Actual</th>
<th>2nd Year Proposed</th>
<th>3rd Year Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CATCH</td>
<td>$593,305</td>
<td>$722,964</td>
<td>$785,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crime Investigation Pilot Study</td>
<td>452,490</td>
<td>422,250</td>
<td>437,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expansion of Tactical Deployment</td>
<td>1,764,500</td>
<td>1,470,883</td>
<td>1,532,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fence Control</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>336,493</td>
<td>288,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Helicopter Alert</td>
<td>47,737</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Real Time Tactical Deployment</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>35,294</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GOAL I</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,968,032</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,987,884</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,063,585</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Reduce stranger-to-stranger crimes of murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault in the City of Dallas by 20% in one year.</th>
<th>1st Year Actual</th>
<th>2nd Year Proposed</th>
<th>3rd Year Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expand Crime Lab</td>
<td>$167,525</td>
<td>$228,928</td>
<td>$147,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Police Artist</td>
<td>5,647</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>6,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Police Data Base Expansion</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Upgrade Criminal Justice System Response</td>
<td>68,958</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Violent Crime Information Exchange</td>
<td>24,617</td>
<td>24,617</td>
<td>24,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GOAL II</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,412</strong></td>
<td><strong>$193,924</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Reduce juvenile related stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary in the City of Dallas by 3% in one year.</th>
<th>1st Year Actual</th>
<th>2nd Year Proposed</th>
<th>3rd Year Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Juvenile Department Court Action Processing Unit</td>
<td>$269,689</td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td>$278,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Juvenile Department Detention Home Medical and Logistical Program</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>116,250</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth Development and Corrections</td>
<td>150,814</td>
<td>148,462</td>
<td>154,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Youth Services Program</td>
<td>522,833</td>
<td>529,412</td>
<td>551,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GOAL III</strong></td>
<td><strong>$943,336</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,090,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,089,884</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Reduce drug related stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary in the City of Dallas by 3% in one year.</th>
<th>1st Year Actual</th>
<th>2nd Year Proposed</th>
<th>3rd Year Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drug Abuse Enforcement</td>
<td>$20,425</td>
<td>$132,353</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Treatment Alternative to Street Crime</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GOAL IV</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>$632,353</strong></td>
<td><strong>$612,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Reduce stranger-to-stranger crimes and burglary committed by repeat offenders in the City of Dallas by 5% in one year.</th>
<th>1st Year Actual</th>
<th>2nd Year Proposed</th>
<th>3rd Year Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Book-In Unit for Dallas County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$198,350</td>
<td>$208,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create Two Temporary District Courts</td>
<td>750,536</td>
<td>818,824</td>
<td>855,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Halfway House</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase Adult Probation</td>
<td>787,749</td>
<td>1,105,250</td>
<td>1,347,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal Aide for Police</td>
<td>164,795</td>
<td>160,588</td>
<td>168,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pre-Trial Release</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>270,285</td>
<td>298,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prosecutor's Training</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>49,765</td>
<td>52,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Word Processing System for District Attorney's Office</td>
<td>105,525</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GOAL V</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,808,605</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,666,812</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,994,251</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,032,945</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,652,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,954,204</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. STAFF BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARIES
DON CLEVELAND, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DALLAS AREA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL
(Biographical Sketch — October-1971)

Don Cleveland was born in Fort Worth, Texas, on December 1, 1937, but grew up in Stephenville, Texas. He graduated from high school in Stephenville where he was active in all sports, several clubs and the student council. As an undergraduate, he attended Tarleton State College in Stephenville prior to receiving his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Texas at Austin. Major areas of undergraduate study included political science, history and economics.

After graduation, he entered the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Texas. Upon completion of graduate studies in Public Administration, he was associated with the City of Austin as Administrative Intern on the City Manager's Staff. He has served as Assistant City Manager in Mesquite, Texas and as City Manager in Lancaster, Texas. While in Lancaster, he received several awards of recognition in the areas of finance administration, budgeting, and capital improvements programming. He has been employed by the Republic National Bank of Dallas as an Investment Officer in the field of municipal bonds, federal government securities, and securities issued by the governmental agencies. Don comes to the Criminal Justice Council from the North Central Texas Council of Governments, where his responsibilities included administration of the applications review program and the coordination of several municipal service planning programs.

Don Cleveland, his wife Carol and their two children reside in Lancaster, Texas, where they are active in civic and church work. Carol received her M.A. degree from East Texas State University and is a teacher in the Lancaster Independent School System.
Ray Ryan was born in Texarkana, Texas, on October 11, 1937, attended public schools there, and graduated from Texarkana Texas High School. He was active in a number of extracurricular activities including sports.

After graduating from high school he was employed by Chance Vought Aircraft in Grand Prairie, Texas, as a tabulating machines operator. He subsequently was employed as accounting machines operator by the General Electric Company in Tyler, Texas, and Allstate Insurance in Dallas.

Ray attended night school at Tyler Junior College and Arlington State College prior to acquiring his Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. He studied at North Texas State University while employed at night as a computer operator by the Service Bureau Corporation (subsidiary of I.B.M.). Upon graduation from college, he was promoted to the position of Internal Auditor by S.B.C., where he was based in New York City and travelled from city to city performing audits of S.B.C. branch offices.

Subsequently he served as Operators Manager of S.B.C.'s local data center, Systems Representative, and in personnel and administrative capacities with the Contract Programming Division of the Company.

Ray comes to the Criminal Justice Council from the Data Services Department of the City of Dallas where he served as Systems Analyst.
Charles J. Tusa was born in Houston, Texas, on November 26, 1942, and grew up in Waco, Texas. He graduated from high school in Waco where he was president of the Student Council and National Honor Society as well as being active in all sports. As an undergraduate, he attended George Washington University in Washington, D. C., prior to receiving his Bachelor of Business Administration degree from the University of Texas at Arlington. Major areas of undergraduate study included economics, accounting, and management.

While attending college, he was employed as a clerical employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington, D. C., and Dallas, and later as head coach of two Dallas area grade schools.

Following graduation, he was employed as a Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Salt Lake City, Utah, and Detroit, Michigan. While with the F.B.I. in Detroit, he held the position of Police School Coordinator for that office and in this capacity directed the training program for the state's law enforcement officers. He was commended for his work on several occasions by the Director of F.B.I. during his five and one-half years of service.

Charles and his wife Liz have one child and reside in Carrollton, Texas.
Joe Hanna was born in Fort Worth, Texas on April 9, 1947, but grew up in Dallas, Texas. He attended Dallas public schools and graduated from W. H. Adamson High School in 1965. After high school, he entered North Texas State University and graduated in 1969 with a B.S. degree in psychology and sociology.

After graduation he entered the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas on a graduate fellowship. While completing his graduate degree, he taught sociology within the department. He graduated with a M.A. degree in Criminology and Corrections in 1971.

After receiving his graduate degree, he was offered a N.I.M.H. Criminology fellowship in the doctoral program at the University of Montana. After spending one year in this program, he came to work for the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council.

His past work experience includes research in corrections, mental health, and the courts. He has also participated in numerous workshops and seminars in criminal justice. Professional memberships include Alpha Kappa Delta (National Sociological honor society) and the American Society of Criminology.

Joe and his wife Betsy now reside in Dallas. Betsy received her B.S. degree at North Texas State University and is currently teaching in the Richardson Independent School District.
NELIA L. SCHRUM
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
DALLAS AREA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL
(Biographical Sketch — April-1972)

Nelia L. Schrum was born in Chicago, Illinois, on September 11, 1950. She attended high schools in New Jersey and Germany and graduated in Dallas.

As an undergraduate, Nelia attended Southern Methodist University, graduating with honors in Political Science in 1971. While at S.M.U. she was named to Phi Beta Kappa, and Pi Sigma Alpha, the national political science honorary. She is also a member of the American Society for Public Administration.

After graduation, she entered the Public Administration Master's Program at S.M.U. on a graduate fellowship from the Arnold Foundation. While completing her MPA, she taught urban studies at the Hockaday School and served as a counselor.

Nelia has served as an Administrative Assistant to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Dallas Regional Office. She has also completed research on heroin in the Dallas area through a Sloan Foundation research grant.

Nelia and her husband, Everett, reside in Dallas. Everett received his B.A. from Southwestern University and is currently pursuing graduate studies at the Southern Methodist Perkins School of Theology.
III. REPEAT OFFENDER RECOMMENDATIONS
Miss Dickerson has been secretary to the Executive Director of the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council since February 16, 1972. Prior to joining the DACJC staff, Miss Dickerson worked in a secretarial capacity in the Office of the City Manager in Dallas.

Miss Dickerson moved to Dallas in August, 1970. She was born in Laurel, Mississippi, and completed her primary and high school education there. She attended Jones County Junior College in Ellisville, Mississippi, for a year and a half where she received a Certificate of Achievement in Secretarial Training.

Miss Dickerson is currently a resident of Dallas.
REPEAT OFFENDER RECOMMENDATIONS

During 1972, the Dallas Police Department generated a study dealing with the effect of the repeat offender upon the total crime situation within the City of Dallas. The study, released on September 28, 1973, relied principally on randomly selected arrest data during three months of 1972 and was supported by statistical data and information obtained through interviews of Dallas County prisoners confined in the Texas Department of Corrections.

The results of this study prompted the Executive Committee of the Dallas Area Criminal Justice Council to create this temporary Task Force to consider the current policies and procedures in operation within the Dallas criminal justice system in relation to the repeat offender. This Task Force is comprised of Chief Frank Dyson, Chairman; District Attorney Henry Wade; Judge John Mead; Sheriff Clarence Jones; and, Chief Probation Officer J. C. Ledbetter.

The intent of the Task Force is to make specific recommendations aimed at reducing the crime problems created by the repeat offender. Some of the problems outlined in the Repeat Offender Study were as follows:

- Arrest statistics indicate that almost 60 percent of the suspects filed on by the Dallas Police Department are repeat offenders. Furthermore, they are responsible for 90 percent of the multiple clearances recorded and the commission of 99 percent of the offenses admitted by prison inmates.
- During 1971, repeat offenders were responsible for approximately 22,750 index crimes which was slightly less than half of the total recorded in the city during the year.
- Almost 70 percent of the persons charged with burglary were repeat offenders, and 64.5 percent of the persons charged with robbery were repeaters.
- Lack of continuity of information on criminal cases to permit measurement, evaluation and correction of problems in the criminal justice system in Dallas.
- Only one-half of the cases cleared by arrest are actually filed with the District Attorney or Juvenile Court.
- It is possible for repeat offenders to amass bonds and continue their criminal activities while awaiting trial.
- No systematic method exists where cases against repeat offenders can be disposed of quickly and routinely.
- An overwhelming majority of multiple offenders receive concurrent sentences for the crimes they commit.

On February 16, 1973, the Repeat Offender Task Force met for the first time and considered many of the problems outlined in the Study. Judge Mead and Sheriff Clarence Jones were unable to attend this meeting. Deputy Jack Faulkner represented Sheriff Jones.

At this meeting a directive was issued to create a Sub-Task Force comprised of representatives from each of the participating offices for the purpose of defining and introducing policy recommendations as to the most explicit course that the entire Dallas criminal justice system should take in order to implement and administer a program dealing with the repeat offender.

Consigned with this responsibility, this Sub-Task Force met on February 21, 1973. Participating at the meeting were Mr. Ledbetter; Jim Barklow, Assistant District Attorney; A. J. Brown, Director, Dallas Police Department; and Jack Faulkner, Deputy, Sheriff's Office. In pursuing the delegated task, the following definitions and recommendations are being made by the Sub-Task Force for consideration and further recommendation to the DACJC Executive Com-
committee. The recommendations should be considered in relation to several items of legislation now pending before the Texas Legislature. Much of this legislation has been prepared by the District Attorney and the Dallas Police Department and would, if adopted, directly support the implementation of some of the recommendations. A topical summary of the pending legislation is attached.

**DEFINITION 1**

THAT THE REPEAT OFFENDER BE BROADLY DEFINED TO INCLUDE ALL PERSONS WHO ARE FILED ON FOR A FELONY OFFENSE AND HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN CONVICTED FOR A FELONY OFFENSE PENDING AT THE TIME OF ARREST.

Specifically, that the repeat offender be defined as:

A. Case Active
   1. Any person who is filed on for a felony offense and who is subsequently filed on for another felony offense while on bond for the previous felony offense.
   2. Any person who is filed on for a felony and is subsequently filed on for another felony during the term of probation for the previous felony offense.

B. Case Inactive (commonly referred to as “recidivist”)
   1. Any person filed on for a felony offense who has previously been convicted of a felony offense.
   2. Any person filed on for a felony offense who has previously been placed on probation for a felony offense and the term of probation has expired.

In defining the repeat offender, the Sub-Task Force was cognizant of the fact that the wide definition chosen encompassed more than has been in the past. There was a desire, however, to attack the problem in a complete, direct, straightforward manner and thereby resist the propensity to provide only patchwork solutions.

**DEFINITION 2**

THAT IMPACT CRIMES BE DEFINED AS MURDER, RAPE, ROBBERY AND THEIR CORRELATED ASSAULTS AND BURGLARY, AS OCCURS BETWEEN STRANGERS.

Aggravated assault and other misdemeanor assaults are included in some LEAA guidelines setting forth the definition of an Impact crime. Due to the infrequent incidence of these crimes as they occur between strangers in Dallas and the fact that they are misdemeanors, the Sub-Task Force is recommending that only felony cases be considered. The inclusion of misdemeanors in this definition would not be conducive to priority handling throughout the Dallas Criminal justice system, especially at the trial level. Therefore, adding assault cases would serve no purpose. Impact funding of two temporary District Courts for Impact cases supports the fact that only felony cases should be considered.

In addition, because of the significance of the Dallas Impact Program in terms of reducing crime in Dallas, the amount of money being spent, and the resulting requirements of priority which have taxed all elements of the Dallas criminal justice system, any policies developed concerning the repeat offender must be conducted with an awareness of the possible complications of imposing additional stress on the system itself.

It was the feeling and intentions of the Sub-Task Force to bring about necessary changes in the system that would allow for positive and quick justice regarding the repeat offender. The administrative buildup that is required in order to achieve this goal should be accomplished, whenever possible, parasitically with the requirements of the Impact Program so that the assistance and support of each can be attained through as great a common effort as possible.
RECOMMENDATION 1

THAT, BECAUSE OF THE CONSTANT THREAT THAT BOTH THE IMPACT OFFENDER AND THE REPEAT OFFENDER POSE TO THE COMMUNITY, PRIORITY BE GIVEN IN SCHEDULING THESE CASES FOR TRIAL WHENEVER FACTS, CIRCUMSTANCES, AND FEASIBILITY PERMIT.

The following priority should be considered:

A. Repeater-Impact offenders who are in the custody of the jail.
B. Repeater-serious crime (formally defined as “capital” crime) offenders, including those offenders who have been charged with the sale of narcotics and dangerous drugs, who are in the custody of the jail.
C. Repeater-Impact offenders who have been released on bond or are otherwise not in custody of the jail.
D. Impact offenders who are in the custody of the jail.
E. Repeat offenders who have been released on bond or are otherwise not in the custody of the jail.
F. Persons who have committed serious crimes whether they be in custody of the jail or released on bond or are otherwise not in custody of the jail.
G. All other offenders whether they be in custody of the jail or released on bond or are otherwise not in custody of the jail.

Based on the data available in the Repeat Offender Study of the Dallas Police Department, the threat of repeat offenders being responsible for more than half of all Dallas crime should solicit a response of giving this offender, whenever possible, priority consideration in channeling him through the system so that his imprint on crime in the area can be minimized. Expeditious handling of this offender once he enters the system may be of assistance in curtailing his threat of committing more crimes by providing swift justice. Every consideration should be given to shortening his waiting time from indictment to trial.

Coupled with the thrust of the Impact Program, this recommendation takes into account that first consideration be given to those who are in custody in order that the problem of jail overcrowding is not worsened by the imposition of these priorities. Priorities A and B of this section relate to this problem. It further takes into consideration that at the time an offender is identified as a repeater the system will take every legal advantage to confine him in jail so that he cannot continue his criminal activities.

Additionally, Priority B relates to the commission of serious crimes (capital crimes as distinguished from Impact crimes) throughout the entire county by repeat offenders. Serious crimes in this instance has been interpreted to also include the sale of narcotics and dangerous drugs. When these offenders are in custody the scheduling of their trials should be given high priority.

Priority C relates to the repeat-Impact offenders who are not in custody and are free to commit other crimes. It is hoped that these individuals would be placed in custody at the time they are first identified as repeaters. Recognizing, however, that there may be instances where this may not be possible, then the scheduling of their cases for trial should be given as high consideration as possible.

Priorities D through G take into consideration the remaining combination of situations relative to trial scheduling.

It should be emphasized that these priorities are not to be considered as a rigid procedure in all cases. Certainly, this is not practical. What is important, however, is that consideration be provided to the administration of cases in light of the threat posed by each classification of criminals.
RECOMMENDATION 2

That strong support be given to the implementation of a criminal justice information system that would include management and tracking capabilities which would allow all agencies to adequately attend to the problem of identifying the repeat and impact offender throughout all phases of the system so that an adequate response can be made.

The police, prosecution, courts, and district clerk, as well as the rehabilitative agencies, each use a distinct system for sorting, filing and retrieving information concerning criminal cases. Presently there is not in existence a method for quickly finding specific information for management decisions from the system's components. As an example, there is no way to inquire quickly into the police component or any other component of the criminal justice system to determine disposition statistics by offense. Through the present system it is not possible to learn quickly how many robbery cases were filed in any given month, how many robbery indictments were returned on these cases, how many robbery cases were prosecuted, or how many robbers were placed on probation, acquitted or sent to prison.

Additionally, the success of the Repeat Offender Program will vitally depend on rapid identification and tracking capability throughout the system. As an example, investigators should be provided with the capability to identify a repeat offender as soon as he is arrested. At the present time this cannot be done quickly by checking records at any central location. Presently the most complete records available for this purpose are maintained by the Sheriff's Office. In order to gain quick identification of the repeat offender, this information should be made computer-accessible to other elements of the system.

In order to unify the information system it would be necessary to perform some system design work that would produce defined information needs. If the Task Force agrees that this need is essential, it is recommended that the Sub-Task Force be reconvened to study and develop an inter-component information system and submit that design to the Task Force for review and acceptance. It is recommended at this time, however, that strong support be given for the establishment of this information system in order to provide the necessary impetus to the idea of information exchange. Such an exchange would be vital in directing and administering a repeat offender program.

RECOMMENDATION 3

That an aggressive policy of prosecution dealing with the multiple offender be adopted that will be mutually agreeable to the police function, prosecution function, and court function.

While the goals of each of these functions are the same, that is to reduce crime, the responsibilities of each differ widely. Essentially, the function of the police is to develop prosecutable cases, the prosecution function is to initiate court proceedings, and the court is charged with the responsibility of administering justice.

The Repeat Offender Study reveals that the Dallas Police Department, on an average, has a one-to-one relationship of cases filed against each person charged with an offense. Considering the problem of the repeat offender's prolific activities, it is apparent that many solved, prosecutable cases are being deferred and that this practice may be a contributor to the overall repeat offender problem.

On the other hand, it is doubtful that the Dallas criminal justice system could withstand the inundation if police chose to indiscriminately file all cases against all suspects. Clearly, the effect upon the Grand Jury, District Attorney's Office, and the Courts would be most detrimental to attempts to increase the efficiency of these processes that are already severely taxed.
What must be developed is a mutual strategy among the various criminal justice functions whereby the maximum benefit in terms of holding the repeat offender accountable for his activities is obtained.

The ramifications of this problem are set forth on Pages 12 and 13 of the Study Summary and it is believed important to the Task Force that it be re-stated:

"It is apparent that the practice of NOT filing all of a suspect's cases is inspired by the desire to obtain more clearances and thereby appear effective to the public when a high clearance rate is announced. Further, many policemen have expressed concern that political pressures would ensue if Dallas' clearance rate fell below the national norm. However, very little property is recovered from clearing these unfilled cases and no additional prosecution or sentencing is evident as a result of clearing these cases. Indeed, there is a distinct possibility that the police file fewer cases in order to entice more admissions from these suspects.

The product of this practice is difficult to fully assess. Obviously, the courts could not prosecute all the cases, yet the arbitrary dismissal by the police of all of these cases probably serves to diminish the effectiveness of all the individuals and agencies who participate in the practice since it creates a false picture of success. Without a full knowledge of the number of cases for which a suspect stands accused, the prosecution is limited in its understanding of the scope of a suspect's criminal activity and is, therefore, not responsible for less-than-vigorous prosecution.

A strict interpretation of the law would no doubt lead one to conclude that it is illegal for the police to fail to file a case against an individual who is thought to be guilty of a crime to the extent that the case can be cleared. Furthermore, such arbitrary action leaves the door wide open for allegations of misconduct, bribes and the like. Rather, it would seem sounder policy to present all the evidence against a person along with all the cases he acknowledges to the District Attorney and rely on that office to determine prosecution.

Under Texas law, the decision to initiate a criminal case is the prerogative of the District Attorney, grand jury, and examining courts, not that of the police."

It is clear, especially in the area of filing multiple cases, that there needs to be created a stronger system of liaison between the investigator who develops these cases and the prosecutor who has the responsibility to bring these cases to trial. At the least, strong, explicit, and aggressive policies should be established between the police and prosecution functions that would serve to deal effectively with curbing the repeat offender. It is believed that such policies would serve to:

1. More adequately respond to the multiple crimes committed by the repeat offender,

2. provide the Dallas criminal justice system with a prosecution-oriented policy that could possibly become a crime deterrent in itself, and

3. would serve as an added incentive to the police to expend more effort on multiple clearances to affect additional property recoveries and to develop additional prosecutable cases.

Strong support should also be given to encourage the Courts to consider the imposition of consecutive (stacked) sentences in those instances of multiple offenses that display flagrant and gross disregard for the law. More use of consecutive sentences could well serve notice to the criminal element that Dallas' tolerance for multiple criminal acts is extremely low and that they may expect to be held accountable for all that they have been found responsible.
**RECOMMENDATION 4**

THAT THE HABITUAL CRIMINAL BE IDENTIFIED AND PROSECUTED AS SUCH IN ALL FEASIBLE CASES.

During 1972, 233 habitual criminal cases were prosecuted by the Dallas County District Attorney's Office. Based on available information the actual number of defendants who could be classified as such far exceed this amount. Because of the recurring crime tendencies of this group of repeat offenders, it is recommended that they be dealt with as severely as possible.

In most instances the most expedient way of prosecuting the defendant as a habitual criminal is for the police department to provide the proper information to the District Attorney's Office at the time the case is filed. It is recommended that the police department increase its efforts to identify for prosecution the habitual criminal in order to take advantage of this prosecution tool in dealing with this group of repeat offenders.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF DALLAS AREA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL**

At the request of the Task Force the DACJC has undertaken the assignment to identify additional needs and attendant resources to assist the Dallas criminal justice system in developing a comprehensive approach to control and redirect the repeat offender. The following recommendations are in response to this assignment.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

THAT THE DALLAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES BE COORDINATED TO ESTABLISH A HALFWAY HOUSE THAT WOULD SERVE THOSE DISCHARGED FROM TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS WHEN THEY RETURN TO THE DALLAS COMMUNITY.

Presently there are no provisions to provide assistance to those offenders who are discharged from Texas Department of Corrections. Dischargees usually have no family, no close friends, no community ties, no prospective employment, and no place to reside upon returning to this area. Discharged convicts receive only a suit of clothes and $50 which is intended to give them their basis for a fresh start in returning to society. The fact that many of these individuals return to crime, thus becoming repeat offenders, should not be surprising.

Included in this recommendation is the need to develop employment sources, counseling, and other related assistance that would provide the basis from which a person discharged could operate until he becomes established in the community. The assistance of parole authorities as well as community-based groups such as the Dallas Crime Commission would be invaluable in making this recommendation operational. Other resources such as the Texas Rehabilitation Commission can support the program with technical staff and financial resources in helping to develop a total program for the dischargee.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

THAT STRONG SUPPORT BE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DALLAS AREA CORRECTIONAL FACILITY EMBRACING THE CONCEPT OF A COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAM.

While the problems outlined in the Repeat Offender Study are not purported to be unique to the Dallas area, the identification of the seriousness of this situation has served to highlight the need for a total effort in dealing with the repeat offender in order to both reduce their number and to curb their criminal activities.

The basic objective that should be remembered throughout this repeat offender effort is to achieve a positive, permanent change in the influence that the repeat offender is having on this community.
It has been suggested that strict policies regarding bail should be implemented. This would, in effect, mean that more people would be remanded to jail to await trial. Based on the Study, this would eliminate a substantial amount of crime. It is not altogether practical, however, to impose such a policy when we are faced with the very serious problem of an overcrowded county jail.

Another aspect of this problem that has been addressed is the crime problems posed by those persons discharged from Texas Department of Corrections. It has been noted that those persons discharged from prison have not qualified for parole generally because they have no family, few close friends, no strong community ties, and no prospective employment upon which to rely. The prospects and opportunities for those discharged to succeed legitimately are remote at best. Statistically, he will again return to the criminal justice system.

The development of a correctional facility for the Dallas area would enable the Dallas criminal justice system to direct attention to the problems that have been described in a manner tailored to the Dallas situation. This is the most important aspect of this recommendation. The problems of Dallas can best be addressed by the Dallas community as a whole in order that solutions can be developed that have as their direct objective a reduction in Dallas crime.

A correctional facility for the Dallas offender would reduce the overcrowding of the Dallas County Jail by allowing those inmates whose cases have been appealed and those who serve county sentences to be incarcerated in this facility. The removal of these inmates would permit the courts greater latitude in dealing with repeat offenders.

In addition, prior to being discharged from the local facility, the offender could be provided employment and other assistance that would allow him a greater opportunity to become established in the community prior to being released. Resources previously identified could more effectively play an intervening role in the life of the offender.

The intrinsic advantages of such a facility are many. Primarily, its inclusion into the Dallas criminal justice system would allow more management capability of the large number of offenders that are dealt with annually. Administratively it would bring the control to address jail, prison, parolee, and dischargee problems locally. It is suggested that this recommendation would bring to Dallas the necessary capability to deal with the repeat offender problems on a total basis.