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CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE

40 staff Criminal Intelligence Service of Canada & RCMP

3 years of activity
E Division (BC & Yukon)

2,197 people 92% drug involved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor_A</th>
<th>Actor_B</th>
<th>Type_relation</th>
<th>Relation_details</th>
<th>Actor_A_group</th>
<th>Actor_B_group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>bt supply cocaine</td>
<td>G89</td>
<td>G89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>selling drugs</td>
<td>G89</td>
<td>G89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>ran crack houses</td>
<td>G89</td>
<td>G89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>bt have directed take over</td>
<td>G89</td>
<td>G89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>arrested for trafficking</td>
<td>G89</td>
<td>G89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2192</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>Drugs, Cocaine</td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>cocaine network</td>
<td>G38, G90</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>bt have worked together</td>
<td>G47, G82</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>same cell</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G8, G9, G10, G24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>assault</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>cocaine network</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>same cell</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>cocaine network</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9, G38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>cocaine network</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9, G38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>drug trafficking &amp; consp</td>
<td>G38, G90</td>
<td>G90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>Co-Offenders</td>
<td>bt b formerly involved in</td>
<td>G90</td>
<td>G10, G26, G90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different organized crime groups & street gangs & independents

739 people

network perspective

(useful on a static network)
Tactical SNA
(underlying connectivity GRK Case)

prostitute #1
prostitute #2
suspect
prostitution
stroll
last seen
Period 1

6 months

$T_2$
12 months

$T_3$
18 months

$T_4$
24 months

$T_5$
30 months

$T_6$
entire investigation

24 people
102 unique ties
19% density
Period 1
6 months

T_2
12 months

T_3
18 months

T_4
24 months

T_5
30 months

T_6
entire investigation

39 people
220 unique ties
15% density
Period 1
6 months

6 months

59 people
424 unique ties
13% density
Period 1:
- 6 months

Other:
- 66 people
- 556 unique ties
- 14% density
Period 1
6 months

Other
Victim
Suspect

76 people
686 unique ties
12% density
Period 1
6 months

$T_2$
12 months

$T_3$
18 months

$T_4$
24 months

$T_5$
30 months

$T_6$
entire investigation

88 people
1,304 unique ties
18% density
network perspective

(dynamic applications)
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Table 7. Staffing Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total GST Time</th>
<th>Suggested Patrol Officer Staffing</th>
<th>Community Pricing Model</th>
<th>Existing Patrol Officer Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>47.626</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>44.064</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>46.661</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>46.443</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates of existing officer staffing are based on a count of the personnel at the rank of officer who attended at least one call for service during the calendar year. This does not take into consideration actual assignments, extended leaves, promotions, or transfers. As such, these figures may not match official records.

---

Annualized estimate

50% Reactive

11% Proactive

50% Projective

Vaccancy Calls

Hot Spot Areas Where Assaults Lead to Arrests

---
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POP Project
POP Project
network perspective

(inform problem solving)
Interactions among people/groups

dynamic nature of networks

Modified lens

(enhance interdiction efforts)
OUTLINE

- Explain
- Impact
- Idea
- Results
- Learned
EXPLAIN
Cities use CGIs to intervene in, prevent & suppress gang activity in a defined neighborhood.

LA City Attorney’s Office in partnership with LAPD
CA Civil Code sections 3479 & 3480

[...] injurious to health or is indecent or offensive [...], or an obstruction of the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, or unlawfully obstructs the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any navigable lake, river, bay, stream, canal, or basin, or any public park, square, street, or highway.

CCC, 3479.
Common Specifications

Do not associate with other gang members in public

No forcible recruiting or stopping members from leaving
Gang Specific

- No reckless driving or obstructing traffic
- No lookouts or loitering
- No trespass: Gilbert Lindsay Park, Alameda Swap Meet
- No identity theft
- No recruiting children
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 Plaintiff,

vs.

East Side Pain (ESP), aka Ghost Town Bloods, an unincorporated association; and DOES 1 through 100 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: BC 399741

PROPOSED

JUDGMENT

GRANTING PERMANENT

INJUNCTION

Assigned to: Hon. A. Jones
Case filed: October 10, 2008

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, applied for injunctive relief seeking to abate a public nuisance caused by Defendant East Side Pain gang and its members and associates, in the “Ghost Town Safety Zone” in the City of Los Angeles (hereinafter “Safety Zone”). This Safety Zone, depicted in map attached as Exhibit 1, is located in the City of Los Angeles and bounded by: Avalon Boulevard on the West, Deloras Drive on the North to Wilmington Avenue on the East, then to Lomita Boulevard on the North, to Drumm Avenue on the East, then to Pacific Coast Highway on the South, and extending 100 yards to the outside of each of those boundary streets.

This public nuisance is caused by Defendant East Side Pain (ESP), its members and associates, including but not limited to:

Judgment Granting Permanent Injunction, Awarding Damages and Assessing Civil Penalties Against

5th & Hill aka 5 Hill aka SH aka CINCO LOMA, a criminal street gang sued as an unincorporated association;

JESUS BARCENAS (Nene);

EVERADO BAUTISTA aka EVERADO OSORIO (Flash);

ADOLFO CATALA (Ghost, Loco);

ALEX / ALEJANDRO DELATORRE (Looney, Toro);

CHRISTIAN DUARTE (Tin):

JESUS ADRIAN GONZALEZ (Face, Chuy);

MICHAEL ANTHONY GONZALEZ (XL, Loner, Stretch and Esclara);

CARLOS EDGAR HERNANDEZ (Scrappy, Tin);

JUAN BAUTISTA OSORIO (Flame);

CARLOS QUIROZ (Charlie);

MARCO DAVID RIVERA (Huero, Miel);

GUSTAVO ROMAN, JR. (Perkin);

CESAR TOVAR (Bam Bam);

all as individuals; and

DOES 1 through 120, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: BC380877

JUDGMENT GRANTING PERMANENT INJUNCTION, AWARDING DAMAGES AND ASSESSING CIVIL PENALTIES AGAINST 5TH & HILL aka 5 HILL aka SH aka 5 HILL aka SH aka CINCO LOMA, a criminal street gang sued as an unincorporated association; JESUS BARCENAS (Nene); EVERADO BAUTISTA aka EVERADO OSORIO (Flash); ADOLFO CATALA (Ghost, Loco); ALEX/ ALEJANDRO DELATORRE (Looney, Toro); JESUS ADRIAN GONZALEZ (Face, Chuy); CARLOS EDGAR HERNANDEZ (Scrappy, Tin); JUAN BAUTISTA OSORIO (Flame); CARLOS QUIROZ (Charlie); MARCO DAVID RIVERA (Huero, Miel); GUSTAVO ROMAN, JR. (Perkin) and CESAR TOVAR (Bam Bam)

807 people named
46 injunctions against 72 gangs
(78+ groups-CLIQUES)

18th Street
18th Street (Hollywood)
18th Street (Pico Union)
18th Street (Wilshire)
PERMANENT

35% renunciation/opt-out clause
(3 yrs no gang activity & 18+ months work/school)
ROCKARD J. DELGADILLO
(LA City Attorney 2001-2009)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTORNEY (term)</th>
<th># gangs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAMES K. HAHN (1985-2001)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKARD J. DELGADILLO (2001-2009)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMEN A. TRUTANICH (2009-2013)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL N. FEUER (2013 to present)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 STUDIES

4 Studies

UCR crime counts
or CFS (12-18 months)

Compare target areas to
other zones

2 Studies

Surveys of residents

Public perceptions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grogger (2002)</td>
<td>14 CGIs</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>part 1 crime (1993-1998)</td>
<td>target &amp; matched comparisons</td>
<td>5-10% decline in violence/ do displacement</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixed, modest, short-term results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxson et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Verdugo Flats Injunction (2002)</td>
<td>SBDO</td>
<td>Resident surveys</td>
<td>2 target &amp; 2 controls</td>
<td>less visible, intimidation &amp; fear</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennigan &amp; Sloane (2013)</td>
<td>3 CGIs</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Interviews youth (14-21) &amp; crime (2004-2009)</td>
<td>3 target &amp; 1 control</td>
<td>Reduce crime &amp; no effect on group cohesion</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

less intimidation: declines in visibility & fear

short-term effects
Next time

1. Interaction focused
2. Gang involved individuals
3. Longer time frame

Support POP efforts
IDEA
HYPERDYADIC CONTAGION

Independent

Connected

victim of violence
Clustered Violence

If 50% of associates are victims, the odds of being shot increases by 76.9%.

Co-offending network of 169,725 people in Chicago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>6% of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% of people arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% of nonfatal gun injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Papachristos, Wildeman & Roberto 2015.
Risk of Gunshot

arrested, summonsed for a quality-of-life violation, or noncustodial police contacts in Newark, New Jersey, during a 1-year time period (10,531 people)

287 nonfatal & 96 fatal shootings

Source: Papachristos et al., 2015
1. Shootings occurred in a small part of the network (25%) representing less than 1% of the city’s total population.

2. City rate 103 per 100,000 jumps to 950 per 100,000—a staggering 822% difference
Gang members do not kill because they are poor, black, or young or live in a socially disadvantaged neighborhood. They kill because they live in a structured set of social relations in which violence works its way through a series of connected individuals.

(Papachristos, 2009:75)
Pre-injunction

focal gang

Post-injunction

new conflict
continuing
terminated conflict
SAMPLING

72 enjoined gangs

Step 1

G1

gang without an injunction

Step 2

other enjoined gangs
CASE SELECTION

1. conviction for serious violent crime
2. known gang member from enjoined gang (LA)

Data source limitation – CONVICTIONS
PILOT TEST

23 Bloods & Crips gangs with injunctions
284 incidents, 272 are coded (1997-2015)

1,002 victimization pairs
victimization pairs

SHOOTER

ACCOMPlice

VICTIM

2 VICTIMIZATIONS
victimization pairs

SHOOTER

VICTIMS

2 VICTIMIZATIONS
RESULTS
1,002 victimization pairs

- 76% MURDER
  - 61.8% (actual)
  - 14.6% (attempt)

- 16% ROBBERY
  - 14.8% (actual)
  - 1.4% (attempt)

- 7.5% OTHER
  - 5.0% (assault)
  - 2.5% (carjack + rape + kidnap)
INDIVIDUALS

1,002 pairs
952 people
7 victim & offender
Low = 0
High = 110

8.7 average (per group)

114 groups (111 gangs)
MOSH PIT

114 groups (111 gangs)

993 attacks
MOSH PIT

90 groups (88 gangs)

119 attacks
## ATTACKING (TOP 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GANG</th>
<th>ATTACKS</th>
<th>NO. GANGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK P STONES</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAPE STREET</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLIN 40S</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUNTY HUNTER BLOODS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOVER CRIMINALS GANG</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUEBLO BISHOP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENICE SHORELINE CRIPS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLIN 60S</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLIN 20S</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 HOOVER CRIMINALS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>993</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RECEIVING (TOP 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>VICTIMIZATIONS</th>
<th>NO. GANGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-GANG COMMUNITY</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUNTY HUNTER BLOODS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLIN 40S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK P STONES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENICE SHORELINE CRIPS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN STREET CRIPS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAN BLOODS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MONICA 13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLING 60S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCIA 13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CGI EFFECTS?
1. MOST VIOLENCE
2. MOST VICTIMIZATION
3. CASE STUDY
4. CO-OFFENDING
1. MOST VIOLENCE

RULES:
At least 10 victimizations
5 pre and 5 post injunction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Focal Gangs (CGI)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yearly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black P Stones (2006)</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bounty Hunter Bloods (2003)</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grape Street Crips (2005)</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venice Shoreline Crips (2000)</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rollin 60s (2003)</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48th Street Crips (2005)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geer Street (2006)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-gang Community</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. MOST VICTIMIZATION

RULES:
At least 10 victimizations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Focal Gangs (CGI)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yearly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black P Stones (2006)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounty Hunter Bloods (2003)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Bloods (2009)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape Street Crips (2005)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice Shoreline Crips (2000)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollin 60s (2003)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollin 40s (2000)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Crips (2009)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gang Community</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>(227)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. CASE STUDY
BLACK P STONES

1,000 active members in LA
(est. 40,000+ nationwide)

Around since the 1960s in East side of S. LA

Subsets: “City” West Adams/ mid city & “Jungles” in Crenshaw district
BLACK P STONES

Good terms with: Fruit Town Brims & Rollin 20s Neighborhood Bloods (Rollin Stones)

Waged war against: Rollin 30s Harlem Crips, Rollin 40s, & 18th Street.
BLACK P STONES

PRE-CGI

CGI 2006
BLACK P STONES

POST-CGI

BLACK_P_STONES

ROLLING_30S

ROLLING_20S

C_1_P

BLACK_P_STONES_COACCOMPICE

BLACK_P_STONES_COVICTIM

GRAPE_STREET_(PDEA_ROLL_SQUAD)

18TH_STREET_COVICTIM

18TH_STREET

GEER_STREET_CRIPS

BLACK_P_STONES_ASSOCIATE

WEST_BOULEVARD_CRIPS

NON_GANG_COMMUNITY

CGI 2006
4. CO-OFFENDING
co-offending pairs

SHOOTER

0 pairs
co-offending pairs

SHOOTER

ACCOMPlice

VICTIM

1 pair
Number of Accomplices

- 0: 45%
- 1: 31%
- 2: 16%
- 3: 6%
- 4: 2%

Total: 55%
375 pairs

327 same (87.2%)

48 dif. gang (12.8%)

Note: 5 unknown
16 co-offending pairs
19 gangs

32 co-offending pairs
20 gangs
Post CGIs

- 94_HOOVERS
- CRIPS_9000
- 5_DEUCE_HOOVER
- 51_STREET NOTHING BUT TROUBLE GANGSTER CRIPS
- 87TH_STREET
- GRAPE_STREET
- 118TH_STREET_WATTS_Crips
- ROLLING_20S
- BLACK_P_STONES
- INGLEWOOD_FAMILY_BLOODS
- 18TH_STREET_MAZE
- 59TH_STREET_EAST_COAST_Crips
- DUROCC
- HOOVER
- EIGHT_TREY_GANGSTER_Crips
- ORIGINAL_VALLEY_GANGSTER_Crips
- FIVE_FIVE_NEIGHBORHOOD_Crips
- IRROLLING_40S
- DIRTY_OLD_MEN
- ROLLING_60S
LEARNED
headache

cliques

many names

processing

ENTITY RESOLUTION
LESSON 1. BE SPECIFIC

GANG AND

CLIQUE IDENTIFICATION
RESTRICTIONS

- Convergence settings
- Migration
- Life in hyperspace
78% of pilot study gangs

73% of enjoined gangs
use of media platforms is not new
59 nuisance abatement projects
(gang infested buildings)
INJUNCTIONS
DO NOT STAND ALONE

LESSON 2. PACKAGE
Disrupt gang cohesion by reorienting youth toward individual concerns.

Target
1. social structure embedding individuals
2. group’s cohesion
3. linkage to other groups

GANG AUDITS
Focused-deterrence strategies

Source: Sierra-Arevalo & Papachristos 2015.
MAP SOCIAL RELATIONS REGULARLY
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