

Welcome and Introductions

See sign-in sheet

Best Practices and Issues for Enforcement

At the first stakeholders meeting the conversation was focused on abatement. This meeting conversation is to focus on enforcement issues.

Here are some MAG member agency perspectives on issues and efforts regarding graffiti:

- City of Phoenix
 - Have difficulty in getting police officers to complete reports when there is a graffiti offense. Especially recording the timing of incidents.
 - With a busy shift, officers have competing priorities and graffiti may not always be at a high priority level.
 - Consider making the reports easier to complete.
 - Through a call versus typing.
 - Creating a simpler report template.
 - With budget constraints, there can be fewer officers on the street in a given shift which adds to the difficulty in prioritizing and complete reports when there is a graffiti offense.
 - Officers not always seeing the connection between graffiti and other crimes.
 - The city trained approximately 80 officers last year. This has created more arrests and has created a larger graffiti database. The new graffiti database is 3 years old.
 - The city has a graffiti tracker program: Graffiti Busters
 - 31 cameras with GPS; 120 volunteers
 - Phoenix police hold “coffee talks” to inform the public in ways to reduce blight.
 - When graffiti incidents go down, property values increase 16%.
- City of Peoria
 - Have a six month old graffiti program where information is shared with Maricopa County.
 - Next month will participate in a Valley wide meeting on graffiti.
 - Utilizing the Rocky Mountain Information (R.M.I.) network
 - Add information to and utilize multi-state graffiti database.
 - Learn and participate in quarterly reports.
- Arizona Department of Transportation
 - Shared many of their anti-graffiti efforts at the previous meetings.
 - Indicated that copper theft is a growing problem for ADOT.
- City of Mesa
 - Added that in addition to copper theft, that storm drain theft is a growing problem.
- City of Gilbert

- o Starting to use rainy day fund to cover the costs of graffiti abatement. The reimbursement costs from enforcement penalties do not cover abatement costs.
- City of Glendale
 - o The use of GPS cameras has proven very helpful in prosecution.
- City of Tempe
 - o Pleased with current abatement efforts.
 - o But having difficulty in catching offenders and prosecuting.
- City of Avondale
 - o Utilizing Community Action Team officers to present information to residents on graffiti.
- City of Chandler
 - o Has been aggressive with graffiti abatement.
 - o Abatement team is using GPS cameras to send photos to the police.
 - o Prosecution of graffiti offenses could be stronger.

Other Discussion Points

Considerations for MAG members:

- What are your laws regarding access to graffiti making material?
- What is your definition of graffiti in your local codes?
- What is your approach to property owners who are reluctant to clean graffiti on their property?

Strengthening legislation:

- Adult versus juvenile offenders; what can be done?
- The League is considering state legislation. Resolution offered by Yuma.
- But balancing reimbursement with nature of offense is difficult.
- Graffiti is defined in state statute. However, setting and mandating penalties is difficult.

Youth Education

- Need to identify opportunities to educate youth on why graffiti is wrong.
- City of Phoenix has a program (will contact Phoenix to get a copy to share with stakeholders).

Next Meeting

- Possible report from law enforcement on recent regional discussions.
- Update from the Arizona League of Cities and Towns.
- MAG Graffiti Stakeholders webpage.
- Member agency discussion on formulas to cover abatement costs.
- Salt River Project properties.
- Discuss definitions of graffiti.
- Graffiti and railroad facilities.