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## Deployment Strategies

- There is a "Police Geography"
- Service is influenced by Geography
- What is the best Police Geography?
- Save money
- Equitably distribute limited police resources throughout the city
- Reduce response time
- Create a fair division of risk among police officers
- How can we:
- Obtain the mathematically optimal solution
- Present alternatives to decision makers



## Literature Review

- Determining Deployment Plans
- Historically "By Hand"
- H\&H Method
- Pin Maps
- Heuristic solutions sometimes near optimal
- GIS for combinatorial optimization problems
- GIS is not capable of solving these
 problems optimally
- Other software is, but has no graphic interface
- Optimal Location Models
- Locate facilities in such a way as to optimize an objective
- Many models exist, but few if have been employed in policing


## Maximal Cover for Police Patrols

- Minimizing distance to past crimes is not acceptable
- Encourages location only to high crime areas
- Leaves low crime areas vulnerable
- Service Response Time is crucial to Police Departments
- It is a primary quantitative measure of police service
- First question asked about a call to the police... "How quickly did they arrive?"
- Max Cover can answer many questions for police administrators
- Can our current police geography be redesigned and improved?
- Is there an arrangement that is more equitable in terms of resources and service provision?
- When demand and resources changes in an emergency how should we rearrange our patrols or service?


## The Police Patrol Area Covering Model (PPAC)

- Objective Function
- Maximize the coverage of calls for service
- Constraints
- (1) Covering constraint
- (2) P patrol areas must be determined by user
- (3) and (4) Integer Constraints
- Additional notation
- $\quad I=$ the set of crime locations
- $J=$ potential patrol area command centers
- $S=$ the service distance (desired response time)
- $d_{i j}=$ the shortest distance from $i$ to $j$
- $y_{i}=1$ if an incident location at i is covered by at least one located police patrol area, and 0 otherwise
- $N_{i}=\left\{j\right.$ in $\left.J \mid d_{i j} \leq S\right\}$
- $a_{i}=$ weight or priority of crime incidents at incident location i
- $\quad P=$ the number of police patrol areas to be located

$$
\text { Maximize } \mathrm{Z}=\sum_{i \in I} a_{i} y_{i}
$$

Subject To:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{j \in N_{i}} x_{j} \geq y_{i} \text { for all } i \in I  \tag{1}\\
& \sum_{j \in J} x_{j}=P  \tag{2}\\
& x_{j}=(0,1) \text { for all } j \in J  \tag{3}\\
& y_{i}=(0,1) \text { for all } i \in I \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$ -



## Generating Inputs from GIS

- North Central Division
- 5 Sectors
- 33 Beats
- Find the optimal sector boundaries
- Serve crime or incident locations
- 267 calls for service on 07/20/2002
- Generate 5 best sector command locations
» Beat Centroids
- Generate OD Matrix of Network Distances
- Select those potential command center sites within the service distance of each incident location to generate sets $N_{i}$



## Generating Results

- Export Data to CPLEX
- Number of origins and destinations
- Sets $N_{i}$
- $a_{i}$ values (Call priority values)
- Import Solution back to ArcGIS
- Locate / display command center sites
- Determine closest facility for all incidents
- Generate quantitative comparisons:
» Total Miles Traveled
- Old Solution - 617 Miles Total Miles
- New Solution - 447 Miles Total Miles
- $27.6 \%$ Decrease in Total Miles Traveled
" Worst Case Distance
- Old Solution - 5.23 Miles
- New Solution - 4.40 Miles
- $15.9 \%$ Decrease



## Additional Results - All Divisions

| Division | Existing <br> Total <br> Miles | Optimal Total Miles | \% Decrease in Total Distance | Existing \% of calls covered within $S$ | Optimal \% of calls covered within $S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NorthWest | 625.0 | 534.2 | 14.5\% | 71.1\% | 83.2\% |
| NorthCentral | 616.7 | 446.7 | 27.6\% | 45.7\% | 73.0\% |
| NorthEast | 811.0 | 760.4 | 6.2\% | 66.7\% | 78.3\% |
| Central | 252.3 | 230.0 | 8.8\% | 72.6\% | 83.4\% |
| SouthWest | 841.3 | 727.2 | 13.6\% | 59.1\% | 78.7\% |
| SouthEast | 1252.6 | 959.4 | 23.4\% | 50.3\% | 76.8\% |
| Total Area | 4398.9 | 3657.9 | 18.9\% | 60.9\% | 78.9\% |

## Results over extended time periods

- What is the research time period?
- One day might be appropriate for a particular recurring event
» Football game TX-OU
" Pro Championship
- One week might be appropriate for a festival
" TX State Fair
- Month
- Seasonal differences
- Whole year

| Time Period | Number of Calls | Objective Function Value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 Year | 87,603 | 192,930 |
| Winter | 20,212 | 44,234 |
| Spring | 22,692 | 49,505 |
| Summer | 22,494 | 50,026 |
| Fall | 22,205 | 49,165 |
| January | 6,790 | 15,125 |
| July | 7,220 | 16,246 |
| Week (August) | 1,796 | 4,052 |
| Week (December) | 1,881 | 4,206 |

## Backup Coverage

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i}=(0, P) \text { for all } i \in I \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

- Some incidents require backup
- We want to cover as many as possible, but can we also overlap coverage?
- When backup is maximized
- A few, high priority crimes are covered many times
- Many low priority crimes are not covered
- Backup coverage by itself is not a good objective



## Backup v. Traditional Coverage Tradeoff

| Solution \# | Maximal <br> Backup <br> Objective | Maximal <br> Covering <br> Objective | Total <br> Incidents <br> Covered | Cov1 | Cov2 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2279 | 495 | 170 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 | 2268 | 500 | 172 | 10 | 11 |
| 3 | 2210 | 743 | 244 | 83 | 16 |
| 4 | 2154 | 748 | 246 | 85 | 17 |
| 5 | 2085 | 774 | 253 | 92 | 18 |
| 6 | 2037 | 930 | 296 | 140 | 18 |
| 7 | 2007 | 932 | 297 | 143 | 24 |
| Snip | Snip | Snip | Snip | Snip | Snip |
| 18 | 1632 | 1141 | 368 | 248 | 68 |
| 19 | 1601 | 1215 | 388 | 255 | 133 |
| 20 | 1592 | 1219 | 390 | 261 | 129 |
| 21 | 1541 | 1245 | 400 | 297 | 103 |
| 22 | 1532 | 1249 | 402 | 303 | 99 |
| 23 | 1307 | 1296 | 415 | 412 | 3 |
| 24 | 1298 | 1298 | 416 | 416 | 0 |



## Improvements and Further Research

- Data Issues
- $a_{i}$ values
» The current priority codes are 1 through 5
" Is a call with priority 1 five times more important than a call with priority 5 ?
- Refine the set of potential facility locations
- What are the limits on the number of incidents and locations for solution?
- Formulation Issues
- Maximum crime incident values per patrol area (for equity of risk, workload capacity)

$$
\sum_{i \in N_{j}} a_{i} x_{j} \leq M_{j} \quad \text { for all } j \in J
$$

- Additional Models for Different Deployment Objectives
- P-median for tactical response
- Dispersion for safety
- Flow-covering for interdiction


## Flow Covering Models - Interdiction

- Military "Bridge bombing" models
- Which locations on enemy supply or transport lines should be destroyed
- Maximally disrupt the flow of material or personnel
- Policing context
- Optimally deploy officers for interdiction
- e.g. drunk driving or immigration checkpoints
- Locate in such a way that the greatest flow can be captured by the deployments
- Capture as much flow as possible



## P-Median Models - Tactical Response

- If there are a known set of targets or potential targets
- Minimize Demand Weighted Distance
- Concentrate resources on high demand areas


Minimize $\mathrm{Z}=\sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i} d_{i j} x_{i j}$
Subject To:
$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i j}=1$ for all $i$
$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i j}=P$
$x_{i j} \leq x_{i j}$ for all $i$ and $j$
$x_{i j}=(0,1)$ for all $i$ and $j$

## Maximal Dispersion - Asset Protection

- Maximize the distance between assets
- Preserve asset safety in the event of attack
- Protecting people or facilities that are targets for terror
- P-defense problem
- Maximize the sum of the minimum distances between assets
- Concerned with overall system safety
- Multiple types of assets to protect (Curtin 2002; Curtin and Church 2006)



## Conclusions

- Provide Alternatives
- Provide Objective quantitative measures of deployment performance
- Provide a functional tool for generating both through the integration of GISystems, GIScience, and combinatorial optimization solution procedures

