Strain on municipal budgets for financing public safety is not new. Facing economic stagflation in the 1970s cities told police to do more with less. The result in the 1980s was problem-oriented policing (POP). It is one of five known styles of community policing that uniquely applies situational crime prevention at systemic levels.

As in the 1970s, the additional resources proposed in the 2023 Resource Review for RCMP Prince George Detachment are not sustainable, nor is their evidence that their community policing model is quantifiably effective. The irony is that new recruits have been trained as problem-solvers since the 1990s.

Every city is a network of unique, neighbourhood ecosystems. On an international scale citizens are self-organizing and quantifiably making their neighbourhoods more safe and liveable with **SafeGrowth**.

Picture musicians warming up: Each a master of their instrument making a cacophony of noise; until the conductor introduces a musical score.

Consider a re-engineered "Community Safety Hub" in Prince George as a resource in B.C. Northern Interior for municipalities and First Nation's communities. A center that educating and training citizens for making their neighbourhoods more safe and liveable. A center connecting the dots between community volunteers in Prince George for design of conditions and activities proven to reduce crime and other types of anti-social behaviour.

WHITE PAPER

Crime/Incivilities Harms Prevention & Reduction
Prepared for
The Mayor's Standing Committee on Public Safety

PREAMBLE

This paper considers the: i) the *MyPG Sustainability Plan* (2008), ii) the *Smart Growth on the Ground (SGOG): Downtown Prince George Concept Plan* (2008), iii) efforts by the Downtown Prince George BIA to improve liveability, iv) the unsustainable increase of police resources recommended in the *2023 Resource Review of the RCMP Prince George Detachment* (2023), and v) the wellness impact from workload stress faced by overwhelmed first responders in Prince George.

In scope: i) An upgrade to crime, bylaw and incivilities data collection, its display and analysis in Prince George to facilitate action planning for resolving crime and incivilities problems, ii) informing the Mayor's Standing Committee on Public Safety on advancements in crime prevention theory today with new insights on why people behave and the make the choices that they do, and iii) paving the way for problem-solving that draws from the *social ecology of crime*.

Out-of-scope: The RCMP modifying its community policing model to incorporate *problem-oriented policing (POP)* that systemically attacks the city's crime hot spots and patterns. POP is one of several styles of community policing that rolled out in the 1990s. It made operational sense to operational RCMP uniform police officers when delivered across Canada. Although police problem solving has been introduced at the training academy for nearly twenty-five (25) years, for some unexplained reason the RCMP has not integrated data-driven POP into their community policing strategy. Ultimately to solve many crime hot spots and patterns takes partnership with community stakeholders.

Whether SafeGrowth, problem-oriented policing or ideally both, it begins with a upgrade to what information is collected and how it is publically displayed in Prince George for community engagement and effective decision making on countermeasures.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Crime prevention theory today draws heavily from research on the ecology of crime that is consistent with the insights of human evolutionary and behaviour biology. This paper introduces the ecology of crime and draws heavily from the publication: "SafeGrowth: Neighbourhoods of Safety and Liveability." These insights equally apply to Problem-oriented Policing (POP). Both are SafeGrowth and POP are action-planning models.

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

Scholars and criminologists have written about the theory of crime prevention for a long time. One of the dominant prevention models to emerge in the latter half of the 20th Century was *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)*. It is a model practiced by the RCMP Crime Prevention Unit. It is applied by architects and city planners. It is central to the 2009 publication "*Smart Growth on the Ground (SGOG)* for Downtown Prince George."

This initial version of **CPTED** was the crime prevention darling of the 1970s. It was formulated as an urban design model. The idea is to cut crime opportunities by modifying built space and surrounding environment. This 1st Gen CPTED continues to offer crime prevention tactics that make it more difficult to offend with impunity and it intended to increase the feeling of certainty in getting caught in the act. Strategies include: better lighting, landscaping, street design, building orientation, walking paths, sightlines, area clean-ups and recently CCTV. These tactics are tailored to improving local feelings of *territorial ownership* over risky spaces.

Smart Growth on the Ground (SGOG) for Downtown Prince George draws heavily on the concept of **territoriality**. Territoriality is an idea that, given the right incentives and welcoming urban designs, residents will take pride and ownership in areas around their places of residence, work and play. In turn potential criminals will be less able to offend with impunity as they will find fewer opportunities for crime.

> The seminal book on CPTED was authored in 1961 by architectural journalist Jane Jacobs (*The Death and Life of Great American Cities*). It was followed by criminologist C Ray Jeffrey in 1971 (*Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*). In 1972, architect Oscar Newman added: *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention through Urban Design*.

CPTED faltered in the 1980s across North America - *or rather* - fell off the Top Ten list of popular solutions to crime. New academic theories including rational choice and broken-windows became the dominant political/police flavours of the day. CPTED made a comeback in the late 1990s with Oscar Newman's publication *Creating Defensible Space*.

Oscar Newman's work inspired *Smart Growth on the Ground (SCOG) for Downtown Prince George*. Territoriality held the promise that we can minimize opportunities for crime by influencing how people relate to each other in urban spaces.

A citizen-driven, action planning enhancement to **Smart Growth** has been introduced as **SafeGrowth.** It does not discount Smart Growth. It builds on it with a '**2nd' Generation CPTED** model. In addition to city and police planning with the original CPTED, it engages residents in their neighbourhoods and downtown business cores fearing and/or with a shared concern about crime.

With **SafeGrowth** citizens are educated and trained for conducting their own neighbourhood safety audits. They know their neighbourhood best and make recommendations for interventions that factor four additional inter-related principles and theories to that of Smart Growth: i) *action-based research*, ii) the *social ecology of crime*, iii) *neighbourhood activation*, and iv) *socio-technical systems*. Government plays an important role by removing barriers, modifying and creating reinforcing bylaws, and providing logistics support to residents implementing **SafeGrowth**.

Mayor Simon Yu's leadership funded a **SafeGrowth** proposal for P.G. as a primary step for initiating civic engagement in identifying and addressing the root causes of crime and incivility problems in struggling neighbours and the downtown core. Jane Jacobs in the renown book 'The Death and Life of Great American Cities" (1961) proposed reducing crime by improving social conditions in neighbourhoods. The insights of Jacobs are applied by **SafeGrowth.** It is more sensible, doable and sustainable to place crime audits and prevention strategies in the hands of citizens and the Downtown Business Improvement Association, lessening unilateral dependency on security hardware and other technologies…albeit they do have their place in situational crime prevention applications.

The rest of this paper will dive more deeply into the woods on crime theory for future reference to be drawn on by the Committee when discussing and making decision about public safety in Prince George.

CRIME PREVENTION THEORY TRAPS

This unit reviews crime/place theories introduced and practiced by police for a period that displaced CPTED at center of police cultures. The basic precepts for some of these theories have been floating around for over 100 years and which impact policing decisions to this day. Some have subsequently been qualified. It is important as decision makers, that the Committee on Public Safety have some knowledge on the pitfalls when exclusively relying on these theories.

Routine Activity Theory

Routine activity theory (RAT) was developed as an academic rejection to social ecology of crime solutions. It was promoted as the best way to reduce crime. It proposes that the location of crime opportunities matters most, particularly at the intersection of the offender, the victim and the absence of someone or something to prevent the crime. For a period this became a darling of crime prevention. It disregards a mass of science from multi disciplines that collectively explains the impact of culture and environment on crime.

Routine activity theory attempts to remove the place or person where the target crime is occurring. Ultimately the theory does weigh in with proactive responses, but in the way that does not address the social factors that motivated criminals in the first place. CPTED had been proposed before RAT- the cutting of crime opportunities by modifying and removing the places where offenders and victims routinely come into contact with each other. It addresses effect, but not the cause.

Routine activities might hold theoretical sway with extrapolative (linear) research. But unfortunately it has yet to predict with accuracy where crime will actually happen in the real world and why? In other words, it does not account for the dynamic (nonlinear) behaviour of humanity influenced by environmental factors and biological factors which trigger crime and incivilities in the first place. It is difficult to know with any accuracy what most offenders view as a crime 'opportunity' until after the crime has been committed. Thus routine activity theory remains a retroactive theory requiring crime to occur to prove its truth – a cart before the horse argument so-to-speak - that ends up in the sticky logical error social scientists call a tautology.

> It might be reasonably argued that *routine activity theory* was not developed as a crime prevention theory, except that many researchers and government policy makers for inexplicable reasons consider it a crime prevention method. It is a 'red flag' for the Mayor's Committee when some higher government ideas aren't factoring the dynamics (nonlinear behaviour) of human beings where a city's people and problems reside. It does not address the root causes of crime and incivilities.

Rational Choice Theory and the Crime Triangle – a Veneer

Proper analysis is the first stop in preventing crime. One model proposed was the crime triangle. It is popular among crime analysts. It helps analyze crime hotspots and patterns. It is applied contextually in the problem-oriented policing model. Sometimes it is part of the prevention practitioner's toolbox. It has elegant utility and simplicity.

The crime triangle emerged from "routine activity theory" (RA) in the early 1980s. RA explained some behaviour quite well, like predatory crime (fraud, stalking, drug trafficking). It did so with a simple premise: crime converges at the intersection of: i) likely offenders, ii) suitable targets, and iii) an absence of guardianship (or more recently called 'handlers').

In lay terms, picture the three sides of a triangle with an offender, a victim, and a target/place. When those things come together, so the theory goes, crime goes up. The crime triangle is useful to police and consultants. Break the triangle and you prevent some crime. Want to increase guardianship: Get property managers to keep better control of their properties (1st Gen CPTED). Improve management in bars that over-serve. Simple. Elegant.

So far, so good…except for one thing. This is where it typically ends in the RA world. The crime triangle does not deep dive into the root causes of crime. Why? Because routine activity and its crime triangle progeny is one of those crime and place theories. It ignores why someone becomes motivated in the first place? Yet motive is a key part of the puzzle with public safety. Finally, it does not account for affect (emotions) from environmental conditions in the way evolutionary and behaviourial biologists understand the genesis and triggers of human behaviour.

Rational Choice and the Crime Triangle

RA is less a casual theory explaining why and more a descriptive symbol predicting when, where and how. It ignores why offenders and motivated in the first place. They are motivated for some reasons. The police/consultants who apply this theory identify linear solutionsw. They aren't concerned about why? What motivates people to commit crime is dynamic (nonlinear) based upon a whole range of biological and environmental factors.

More linked to crime and incivilities shorter term harms reduction what can the triangle do?

1. Identify Capable Guardians – cameras, plentiful supervision and so forth. Unfortunately, things like active shooters occur when there are lots of employees and supervisors about. As for CCTV, how often to do we watch night time news clips of robbery/solutions on corner-store CCTV? Cameras don't stop shootings and other impulse crime where rationality is overwhelmed by emotions

2. **Provide time/workplace environment solutions** – preventing guns in the workplace or at public events. Will metal detectors work? Yes, until they don't. How difficult is it for motivated shooters to turn to bombs, use poisonous chemicals or some other means? What is going on the workplace of your city insiders that reduces their emotional resiliency to temptations or to commit workplace sabotage?

3. Disrupt offender modus operandi (not motive). The crime triangle asks "if handlers" (city employees, security etc.) might have intervened. Or preventing shooters from obtaining weapons in the first place?

The crime triangle is a useful, tactical step when applied to situational crime prevention strategies. But it is also a veneer. It is short term tool reacting to crime. But it doesn't address the affect of environment on crime. For this we can turn more to the research by evolutionary and behavioural biologists explaining why people do the things and make the choices that they do.

Smart Growth applying 1st Gen CPTED, plus a city adding more police and bylaw officers is insufficient for turning the tide on crime and incivilities in Prince George. Citizen-driven **SafeGrowth** analysis of neighbourhood crime includes a more robust analytical dialogue to move social life forward in ways that removes negative environments contributing to crime motive.

> Ultimately, if the Mayor's Standing Committee on Public Safety fails to factor environments which contribute to crime, the analysis of crime remains cluttered with junk science and thus the ultimate analysis is junk.

Broken Windows Theory

'*Broken-windows*' is another crime prevention theory that went off the rails through misinterpretation of the original research. Published in 1982 magazine article co-authored by criminologists James Q. Wilson and George Kelling, their research addressed minor offences or signs of disorder that if left unattended under certain conditions creates an atmosphere where more serious crimes feel permissible. One example used was graffiti on the subway cars. Remove it immediately and others are not tempted to copycat.

The theory goes that if criminals assume if no one cares enough about that environment to clean it or care for it; the end result will be more incivilities and criminal behaviour. 'Broken windows' somehow blossomed into zero-tolerance enforcement by the political leaders behind the now infamous New York City PD COMPSTAT culture. Street enforcement mindlessness led to the indiscriminate arrest of marginalized and mentally ill people who were more often the victims of crime that committing it. Police everywhere developed similar quality-of-life, zero tolerance enforcement strategies to clamp down on street incivilities in order, the thought, to prevent crime before it grew out of control.

Aggressive, targeted enforcement of minor offences became a new thing in cities like Toronto (the TAVIS, anti-crime program), Cincinnati (the Quality of Life Enhancement Team) and Baltimore (the 'clear corners, zero-tolerance' campaign). This was a radical departure from traditional police practice where officers used discretion, evening looking the other way for minor incivilities. Perceived abuses manifested in urban unrest to haunt broken-windows enthusiasts.

Initially efforts to prevent violent crime through broken windows tactics were touted as dramatic by the New York City Police Commissioner and Mayor Guilliani. It was said that, as the result of COMPSTAT, a metropolis plagued by decades of high murder rates and fear on the street had taken a huge bite out of crime.

Economists and social scientists took note that crime had declined in neighbourhoods across North America who had not applied broken windows strategies. Something else was actually influencing crime. Worse still; over aggressive enforcement tactics led to profiling and more excessive force. It was eroding respect and trust of police in high crime neighbourhoods. In Ferguson, Missouri and Baltimore, Maryland it resulted in anti-police riots following the deaths of minority youths fuelled by bad public policy.

Ultimately broken windows theory did not repair any 'broken windows', because the theory focused on police performance, not the underlying social conditions that led to crime in the first place.

Summary

The ebb and flow from one prevention theory to another might give the casual observer the impression that all the really occurs when theory becomes practice is a shift from one prevention flavour to the next.

Each new policy regime tries their hand at a different approach. After all, new leaders seldom get their job saying they will do the same thing as the previous leader. But does this mean no crime prevention theory works? Surely the theories leading to those programs arose from some larger philosophies on how to prevent crime? To fully appreciate where ideas emerge regarding preventing crime and creating safer neighbourhoods it is necessary to explore criminological research.

THE EVOLUTION OF CRIMINOLOGY

Criminology - the study of crime and criminal behaviour - has evolved significantly over time, transitioning from early philosophical perspectives to more complex, interdisciplinary approaches. Initially, classical thinkers focused on legal reform and retribution, while later biological and sociological theories emerged, attempting to understand the root causes of crime. Modern criminology incorporates diverse perspectives, including psychological, economic, and even evolutionary viewpoints, to address the multifaceted nature of crime and develop effective prevention and intervention strategies.

Classical School of Criminology

The Classical School of Criminology dates to the 19th Century. Scholars and philosophers posited that crimes emerge from deviants making decisions to maximize their pleasure or minimize their pain. This oversimplification is now challenged by biologists and evolutionary psychologists who posit that there is no such thing as 'free will' – that all human behaviour is about context. To some measure this reinforces research on the social ecology of crime coming at it from a slightly different direction. What is usually missing with theory of crime is evolutionary and biological is the context behind the behaviour.

Positivistic School of Criminology

Decades later, social science introduced additional strategies to the crime prevention repertoire. This "second" wave of crime theory was coined the **Positivistic School**. Philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857) believed in replacing random speculation with scientific evidence to uncover positive facts about the world. To deter the impulses leading to crime, the Classical researchers argue for expanding the criminal justice system, improving law enforcement and enhancements to prison systems. The idea is to minimize gains and maximize risks assuming human beings make rational choices, which we often don't.

> So, why do some people create mischief or display other forms of aggression? Going down this path, biologists explore heritability (traits), gene expression, endocrinology, affect (emotions), environment and so on that influence behaviour. It is complicated, messy. It is something that laws, regulations and enforcement do not account for. As an example particular to Prince George - when solving the problems with marginalized and homeless from this angle, it is biologically logical why they have ended up where they are.
>
> ***If the environments aren't changed in the places where problems manifest today, what is the likelihood things will change in the future?***

In Comte's world, offenders are not to be blamed for faulty reasoning. Instead the offender is a victim of biological disorders, family dysfunction or psychological distress. The 20th Century Positivistic School spawned a multitude of programs to prevent crime such as: psychological counselling, support programs for the at-risk, substance abuse programs, and dozens of others. The single factor in common with all these programs is that interventions are targeted at disposing an individual away from criminal acts.

Thus, the bulk of contemporary crime theory and the programs they embody, arise from different versions of these two dominant crime philosophies. Criminology theories like the broken windows and routine activities assume that offenders scan their physical environment for easy opportunities; or search for cues that no one will stop them so that they can offend with impunity and not get caught.

Law enforcement theories like intelligence-led policing (at least its early version) adopt the scientific analysis promoted in Positivism; but then influenced by Classicalism end up relying on the criminal justice system to prevent crime.

These two philosophies, Classicism and Positivism dominate contemporary crime prevention discussion.

Ecological School of Criminology

Ecology is a natural science focused on knowing the relationships among living organisms and their environment. Ecology considers organisms at the individual, population, community, ecosystem, and biosphere levels. Ecology overlaps with the closely related sciences of biogeography, evolutionary biology, genetics, ethology, and natural/evolutionary history. Social ecology is an academic model researching how people interact with their environment and how these interactions affect society. It examines the relationships between people, communities, and institutions.

This theory emerged from social studies at the **Ecological School of Criminology,** University of Chicago (1920s). Researchers examined the places where crime occurred across the expanding city of Chicago. This was a time when neighbourhoods were transforming with the arrival of European immigrants, African Americans from the south and later Latino American immigrants.

Sociologists at the University of Chicago discovered that rates of juvenile delinquency varied significantly from neighbourhood to neighbourhood and those rates correlated to social conditions in each neighbourhood.

That some areas were worse than others was not new. But for the first time evidence pointed not to the underlined biological flaws in offenders, nor to underlined pleasure-loving deviants; but rather to the social demographic and economic factors…the 'ecological factors'… that triggered crime-causing conditions in each neighbourhood.[1] Today evolutionary and behavioural researchers add biological factors (i.e. traits, genes and gene expression, environmental a cognitive release of hormones).

This is one of those places where things start to become complicated. The debate is not as yet well settled between a psychopath and a sociopath. Currently geneticists hypothesize psychopathy as a gene expression induced by prenatal or post natal environmental triggers and sociopathy as a learned behaviour. The current theory is a psychopath has not emotional connection and thus cannot be rehabilitated… but might be able to learn controls. Where sociopaths still have the ability to empathize with therapy.

Researchers in the ecology of crime school broke neighbourhoods down into 'ecosystems' and explored how they were affected by environment within the context of the larger urban system made up many smaller ecosystems.

An ecosystem defined in biology is a community of organisms and their physical environment interacting together. A human ecosystem model is a way of studying human communities by integrating social, economic, psychological, and environmental factors. It's a more realistic way of managing ecosystems than traditional models, which tend to view humans as separate from the ecosystem.

This ecological view of crime emerges in **SafeGrowth.** The role of place and space, and the ecological conditions within those places become the mainstay for crime prevention programming based in the ecology of crime philosophy. SafeGrowth believes in **collective efficacy** that brings about **social cohesion** inside human ecosystems. Biologists come at it from a different direction recognizing that one of the building blocks of the nature is reciprocal altruism (cooperation) and everything that goes with that. Both of these neighbourhood building concepts exist as integral parts of SafeGrowth. Both emerge as central themes in Robert Sampson's, 2012 epic study on social ecology: *The Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighbourhood Effect*.

---

[1] We are learning much more today about the affect of environment and culture in shaping human behaviour. Evolution is tinkerer, not a builder, and with that comes some pretty complicated 'wiring', not explainable linearly.

Today ecology of crime theories powerfully explain different types of crime. Academics continue to redefine neighbourhood boundaries and explore social forces that hold them together. Biologists/ neuroscientists add a new dimension for contextually explaining what behave the way they do.

ANALYSIS OF POLICE SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS

Since the 1970's police service delivery models have been replacing the professional incident-driven model. Common models include primary response, tiered policing and community policing, each with its own strengths and weaknesses. The Prince George community policing CAPRA model incorporates problem-solving and measures its performance through qualitative community surveys (community feelings about policing). Problem-oriented policing produces quantitative measure of crime and harms reduction outcomes – in other words, the effectiveness of policing with resources at hand.

Professional Incident-Driven Policing

In response to corruption in the 1920s and the advent of automobile, uniform police were removed from the streets and placed in automobiles. Up until the 1970s the focus was on generating new efficiencies in responding to call for service and random patrols assuming they were a deterrent to crime. It became known as *professional incident-driven police service delivery* model. A problem with this model became acute in the wake of events that included the Brixton riots in the United Kingdom and crimes in progress in New York where people did bother to call police. The resulting epiphany was that police had lost connection with the public. Police talked about the 'thin blue line' in the 1970s - white nights defending the masses against crime.

Situational Crime Prevention

Situational crime prevention (SCP)[2] is the hallmark of problem-oriented policing. Hot spot and crime pattern problems are tackled on a scale to be completed in 6 -9 months with no less than 3 -5 simultaneous interventions. SCP effectiveness can be quantified for building a body of situational specific best practices. A matrix for best practices – by not limited to - in five categories has emerged:

- Increasing the effort the offender must make to carry out the crime.
- Increasing the risks the offender must face in completing the crime.
- Reducing the rewards or benefits the offender expects to obtain from the crime.
- Removing excuses that offenders may use to rationalize or justify their actions.
- Reducing or avoiding provocations that may tempt or incite offenders into criminal acts.

Police may modify matrices in specific crimes from ongoing problem-solving experiences. In other words it is not static. It is adaptive.[3]

---

[2] https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/lbrr/archives/cnmcs-plcng/cn35739-03-eng.pdf
[3] It is notable how little reference is made to situational crime prevention is posted to Canadian police services websites, including the crime prevention portal of the RCMP Prince George Detachment website.

Problem Oriented Policing

`Problem-oriented' policing` (POP), one of five styles of community policing, is a strategy that emerged from the 'do more with less' economic crises of the late 1970s. Police research in the United States and the United Kingdom led to POP as a recommended service delivery model. It was designed for identifying and attacking the root causes of crime hotspots and patterns.

The RCMP opted to expand beyond the United States and British SARA (**S**can, **A**nalyze, **R**espond, **and Assess**) problem solving model to client centric services model. The RCMP CAPRA (**C**lients, **A**cquire/**A**nalyze Information, **P**artnerships, **R**esponse, **A**ssessment) places more emphasis on community outreach to identify under or unreported community needs and forming partnerships based upon the clients' perception of crime and incivilities. It goes unmentioned in the 2023 report on the RCMP Detachment. The command of the RCMP Prince George and other RCMP contract detachments may be unaware of proven crime analysis knowhow and technologies for establishing a systemic problem-solving culture.[4]

To be effective POP problem solvers undertake small-scale initiatives against identified crime hotspots and patterns that surface from crime data. It takes little time for these police problem-solvers to realize in tackling the root causes usually requires partnership with the community and civic government.

> *Problem-oriented policing* **i**s an action planning approach aligned with that of citizen-driven **SafeGrowth**. In the case of *problem-oriented policing* for the RCMP Detachment at Prince George, they have the benefit over other municipal police by drawing on the problem-solving training all recruits have now received at the Academy should they opt to apply it.

Intelligence-led policing

There is much confusion in policing between *problem-oriented policing* and *intelligence-led policing*. *Problem-oriented policing* is the more community engagement focus of the two. It is particularly well suited to uniform police and other public safety mandates. Once police data identify crime hot spots and patterns from community complaints and demands for service, partnerships created with community tackle root causes. One of the questions asked: Why is there this level of crime here and not in other locations?

---

[4] This should to be construed with no need to investigate, charge and bring people before the courts as a public safety need. Dangerous and predatory criminals need to be incapacitated. What there we have is little evidence of is threat of the criminal justice system as a stand-alone being a deterrent to crime. In one cause in P.G. a person before the courts who violated probation received probation as a sentence based on a plea bargain. Is this a good use of resources. In the United States people who fail to appear, or violate their probation, are located and arrested by employees of the court system, not the public police.

It is likely important for the Prince George Public Safety Committee to be aware that *Intelligence-led policing* is more deeply embedded in the criminal investigations and criminal intelligence wings of policing. This model is more dependent on the justice system as a response to crime. It gained immense popularity in North America in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks. This is an idea encouraging the use of intelligence tactics for gathering police data that includes informants. The goal is to reduce repeat offences by chronic offenders. There is no consideration of the socio-economic and other factors – including the biology that triggers crime and incivilities.

Today intelligence-led tactics in some circles are evolving to embrace the more holistic elements of problem-oriented policing that preceded it. What to learn from this is that mindset from the outset predicts what attempt to reduce crime and incivilities emerges. In essence it is the police investigations and intelligence divisions attempting to catch-up with the problem-solving practices by uniform divisions. But still, intelligence-led tactics have a long way to go in applying science on the social ecology of crime. You might say it is the business of catching the horse that keeps getting out of the barn, rather than figuring out how to secure the bar door in the first place.

EPILOGUE

Given the increasing strain in municipal budgets and the likelihood things could get worse with the social upheaval afoot with transformation away from the industry age, reliance for public safety and liveability on industrial age police mindset, by-law enforcement is not sustainable in efficiency models. Expectation to reduce crime and incivilities across the board in the context of the Crime Severity Index is not quantifiable. There is no evidence that adding additional police and by-law enforcement officers as a stand along deterrent reduces crime.

Neighbourhoods adopting a citizen-driven action planning approach to crime and incivilities harms reduction based in a new generation of crime prevention is proving quantitatively proving to reduce crime. Police services applying problem-solving systematically as a culture applying situational crime prevention are quantitatively reducing crime in high risk downtown cores and residential neighbourhoods.