

CITY OF AUSTIN

BYRNE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INNOVATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RESEARCH REPORT

David W. Springer, PhD, Principal Investigator and Professor

Michael L. Lauderdale, PhD,

Professor, Public Safety Commission Board Member, and School District Liaison

Noel G. Landuyt, PhD

Heather Cole, LLB, MPA, MEd

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN CENTER FOR SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Assistant Chief Stephen Deaton

Commander Donald Baker

Lieutenant Allen McClure

Sergeant Keith Bazzle

Kyran FitzGerald

Officer Rafael Kianes

Officer Taber White

Officer Frank Wilson

CITY OF AUSTIN POLICE DEPARTMENT



This project was supported by Grant No. 2012-AJ-BX-0015 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The City of Austin is a home-rule municipality located 200 miles via IH 35 from the U. S.-Mexican border, situated in Travis, Hays, and Williamson Counties of Central Texas. The Austin Police Department, BCJI Fiscal Agent and Program Manager, provides emergency and non-emergency services that impact 824,000 residents and an estimated 19 million visitors annually. In response to the FY2012 Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation solicitation, the City selected the persistently distressed Rundberg neighborhood for additional resources in the hope of addressing the considerable challenges that comprise a significant proportion of crime within the immediate area as well as citywide. Termed *Restore Rundberg*, the program is a partnership between the community, government, researchers, and stakeholder groups. This implementation and research plan provides a detailed overview of the innovative strategies that the City and University intend to roll out over the next few years. In general, the strategies focus on addressing persistent crime, physical and social disorder including substantial population migration and immigration, community engagement (including cultural and linguistic barriers), at-risk youth, and the community's relationship with police. The plan is expected to result in a 5% decrease in violent and property crime by the grant end date.

A. Goals. The cross-sector partnership continues into the implementation years with the original goals of the program: to improve public safety; to address social impacts including physical disorder, social economic status and resources, and collective efficacy; and, to ensure the long-term planning and implementation of neighborhood-based revitalization strategies.

B. Objectives. The objectives included with the original grant proposal remain the same, with each tied to one or more measurable outcome.

C. Planning. The planning phase took place over a 13-month period, from November 1, 2012 – December 31, 2013. This plan will be regularly updated to meet the needs of the neighborhood as the project progresses, demographic characteristics change, and crime is displaced or disrupted. Upon approval of this plan and the release of the current fund hold, the City will move forward with implementation. This document will be translated to accommodate those who do not speak English. APD and project partners will continue to collect and report all BCJI performance measures within the BJA online tool. Key project implementation personnel include:

The University of Texas at Austin

- Dr. David Springer, Principal Investigator and Professor
- Dr. Michael Lauderdale, Professor
- Dr. Yessenia Castro, Assistant Professor
- Dr. Noel Landuyt, Research Associate
- Dr. Ahmed Whitt, Assistant Professor

City of Austin Police Department

- Assistant Chief Stephen Deaton, Executive Administrative Oversight
- Commander Donald Baker, BCJI Program Manager
- Lt. Allen McClure, Law Enforcement Liaison
- Sgt. Keith Bazzle, Rundberg Revitalization Team Public Safety Liaison
- Kyran FitzGerald, Grants Coordinator

D. Implementation Strategies and Activities. During the planning year, the City and University worked with neighborhood leaders, stakeholders, individual community members and the Rundberg Revitalization Team to learn more about Rundberg crime issues and associated problems, and to develop strategies and activities related to the accomplishment of program objectives. The original nine program objectives and the detail for moving forward with each are included below, with objectives highlighted blue and grouped as follows:

BCJI and Revitalization Target Areas

Pages 4 – 11

Identify a neighborhood with a concentration of crime hot spots which have for a period of time composed a significant proportion of crime or types of crime

Facilitate collaboration between the Austin Police Department, project partners, and The University of Texas to conduct an analysis of crime drivers and an assessment of needs and available resources

Innovative Crime Solutions and Complimentary Social Services Programming

Pages 12 – 31

Develop a strategy that offers a continuum of approaches to address the drivers of crime, including enforcement, prevention, intervention, and revitalization strategies

Offer ongoing community engagement and leadership building support, and ensure the community is engaged in the process

Implement a comprehensive and coordinated strategy with support from the BCJI TTA provider

Neighborhood Planning and the Rundberg Revitalization Team

Pages 32 – 36

Establish effective partnerships both to provide solutions along the continuum and commit resources to sustain what works

Enhance the Rundberg Revitalization Team with the presence of criminal justice, social service, and neighborhood revitalization partners

Identify new and build upon existing planning efforts to revitalize the neighborhood and address issues that relate to the crime issues identified

Research, Assessment and Sustainability

Pages 37 – 39

Assess program implementation in collaboration with The University of Texas and other research partners, and plan for sustainment of effective strategies with private and public funding

BCJI Allocated Amounts

Grant Fund Allocations	Allocated Amount for Planning*	Allocated Amount for Implementation**	Total
Law Enforcement Partner	\$66,709 (LE overtime and supplies)	\$415,000 (LE overtime, equipment and supplies)	\$481,709
Research Partner	\$75,000	\$225,000	\$300,000
All Other Allocated Funds	\$8,291 (training and supplies)	\$210,000 (\$82,000 specialist and \$128,000 juvenile justice programming)	\$218,291
Total Award Amount			\$1,000,000

**Actual planning-related amounts will be available in February 2014*

***Estimates through 2015*

BCJI and Revitalization Target Areas

Identify a neighborhood with a concentration of crime hot spots which have for a period of time composed a significant proportion of crime or types of crime.

Facilitate collaboration between the Austin Police Department, project partners, and The University of Texas to conduct an analysis of crime drivers and an assessment of needs and available resources.

Strategy


Compstat, an evidence-based practice, was used by the City to determine the primary focus neighborhood. The City will continue to provide for data needs, the analysis of crime drivers, and the identification of available police resources. During the planning year, the University further defined the target areas and will continue to research and recommend options for success in each area as crime is displaced or disrupted. Key personnel will continue to explore ways to improve upon analysis and assessment tools, and will work with project partners to complete asset and resource management efforts.

Research and Recommendations

The Compstat-based selection of the target area (Image 1: light and dark pink shaded areas only) took place in 2012 prior to the submission of the original BCJI proposal. The area has historically seen higher proportions of crime than would be expected for its 5% of city residents, including 11% of violent crime, 7% of property crime, 34% of prostitution incidents, and 9% of Part II crimes citywide. Criminal activity coupled with poverty, disinvestment, and unemployment within the neighborhood discourage redevelopment and economic growth. Approximately 64% of the population speaks languages other than English and a large number of those individuals are classified as refugees. Within Rundberg, 95% of those enrolled in school are considered economically disadvantaged, 59% have limited English proficiency, and 75% are

identified as at-risk for dropping out. In a 2012 City of Austin survey, the Rundberg zip codes were among those with the lowest level of trust in police and feelings of safety.

Image 1



Census data and city tax information shows that a high percentage of the residents of the area are transient. Many of the dwellings are rental units, either multi-family or single family. Thus, while crime may continue to plague the Rundberg area, its occupants are constantly changing, moving in and out. Because of its low-cost housing and proximity to downtown Austin, Rundberg is considered an entry destination to Austin housing but rarely a permanent home. Given the turnover, a place-based analysis for crime prevention is the most appropriate approach (see Weisburd, Groff, & Yang, 2012). In simplest terms, while people change, crime stays the same and this necessitates the need to look at not just people but also the place – what are the characteristics of place that make it more susceptible to crime? This “criminology of place” (Sherman, Gartin, & Buerger, 1989) provides methods for exploring the problem of crime in certain areas. We embrace Weisburd, Groff and Yang’s (2012) conclusions about the criminology of place:

- 1) Crime is tightly concentrated at “crime hot spots” suggesting that we can identify and deal with a large proportion of crime problems by focusing on a very small number of places.
- 2) The crime hot spots evidence very strong stability over time, and thus present a particularly promising focus for crime prevention efforts.
- 3) Crime at places evidences strong variability at micro levels of geography, suggesting that an exclusive focus on higher geographic units, like communities or neighborhoods, will lead to a loss of important information about crime and the inefficient focus of crime prevention resources.
- 4) It is not only crime that varies across very small units of geography, but also the social and contextual characteristics of places. The criminology of place in this context identifies and emphasizes the importance of micro units of geography as social systems relevant to the crime problem.

- 5) Crime at place is very predictable, and therefore it is possible to not only understand why crime is committed at place, but also to develop effective crime prevention strategies to ameliorate crime problems at places (p. 5).


Hotspot policing has been found to be a particularly useful means of combatting crime. The Department of Justice gives hotspot policing an evidence rating of “effective,” the highest level of rating. The hotspot model (Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2012) relies on a variety of components to address crime, including: increased arrests; situational and targeted prevention strategies; and social services. A criticism of hotspot policing is the potential displacement of crime to other areas in the community but studies show that an overall decrease in crime does occur through targeted efforts.

To utilize Weisburd et al.’s (2012) approach, we have identified three hot spots, one in each of the planning areas joined in Restore Rundberg (see map page 40). The hot spots were determined using police crime data (911 calls and police-generated reports) over the last seven years, 2007-2013. We initially limited our hot spot analysis to Part I crimes – murder, rape, aggravated assault and robbery – as violent crimes are often used to determine the overall safety of neighborhoods and contribute most to community concerns of safety. We then completed a second mapping exercise with Part II crimes and found the hot spots unchanged.¹ Following the majority of year 1 police initiatives, we completed another hotspot analysis to determine if any significant change occurred. No significant change was registered.

In the initial hot spot analysis, the entire Rundberg area mapped out as one giant hot spot. Upon further investigation, we found that the coding of certain locations and types of crime were diffusing the hot spots. To address this, we controlled for property crimes in large commercial spaces (e.g., Walmart and HEB, a local grocery store). We also removed domestic violence crimes from the analysis. The latter decision was made because of other initiatives currently ongoing within the city and county to address the problems of domestic violence (family violence, stalking and dating violence). With these crimes controlled for, we were able to identify seven potential hot spots. All seven hot spots are shown on Image 2, with notations next to the three recommended for resources. The remaining four areas will be used as comparison hot spots to measure the impact of our proposed strategies and to gauge displacement effects.

¹ For reference, Part I crimes include violent crimes – homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault and property crimes including burglary, theft and auto theft. Part II crimes include sexual offenses, other assaults, criminal mischief, prostitution, narcotics, weapons violations and disorderly conduct.

Image 2



We attempted to follow Weisburd et al.'s model (2012) of scoping hot spots down to street segments. However, in working with the police software (Versadex) we found that such narrowly focused crime detail was not available. Police reports often attached crimes to neighboring buildings or street corners. In addition, we found that plotting the crimes by noted addresses marked a larger catchment area than one street segment. To address this, we drew out hot spot boundaries slightly larger than best practices from the research would suggest. However, we believed this was better supported by the crime data available.

To ensure that we identified appropriate hot spots, we relied upon qualitative data from interviews with police personnel responsible for the area, community meetings and agency contacts, local residents and systematic observations of elements of disorder of the proposed hot spots. Appendix A includes the observation protocol employed for the physical survey. The observation data was collected by members of the research team from the School of Social Work and by Master's students at the School of Social Work who undertook the observations as part of a graduate course under the supervision of their professor and members of the research team.

Hot Spot Similarities

The three selected hot spots represent areas of concentrated Part I and Part II crimes. The crime problems have remained consistent over the last seven years. Residents and direct observations confirm that the areas look and feel unsafe, with all three backed by vacant lots and open fields, persistent drug and prostitution activity, gang activity, litter and garbage, oddly placed pay phones, drug paraphernalia, poor parking conditions, graffiti, and loitering. Small businesses in the hot spots cater to quick encounters and criminal activity, with in and out access (gas stations, convenience stores, smoke shops, liquor stores).

We believe that in all three hot spots actual crime rates may be far greater. Many residents come from countries where strained police relationships are the norm. For many residents, the high visibility of crime is indicative of a lack of police presence and the lack of community engagement within the targeted hot spots is quite evident. Those residing in and visiting the area are reluctant to cooperate with police, have a general mistrust (creating hot spots of distrust) and are likely not reporting the extent of crime issues within their areas. As seen in the larger Rundberg neighborhood, the hot spot areas have large immigrant, refugee and homeless populations. Overlaying census data with the crime data, we determined that the majority of community members are Hispanic, non-English speakers. The consensus during planning year interviews was that the majority of the target population mistrusts the police, local banking system, and government resources in general. Residents tend to fend for themselves even when resources that may assist in their ability to raise their standard of living are actually available. It is known by the criminal element that many of the people in this area carry large amounts of cash on their person earned by the various types of work they are able to find. These individuals are daily targets due to fear that if the police are called, they will ignore the crime at hand and focus on the immigration status of the person requesting help.

Overall, the three hotspots account for 21% of crime in the Rundberg area and almost 12½% of crime citywide. Approximately 91.5% of perpetrators are male, with over 50% Hispanic. The majority of crime victims (80%) are male, with over 66% Hispanic. Children, ages birth to 9, are the fastest growing age demographic and youth under 17 comprise approximately 30% of the BCJI target area population.

Hot spot analysis reflects some marked difference in the days of crimes occurring (Monday through Sunday) with higher rates on Saturday and Sunday. Overall, crime is occurring every day of the week with some peaks on the weekends but not at a hugely disproportionate rate when the three hot spots are considered in aggregate. Timing of criminal activity runs from late afternoon to early morning on the weekends (Friday to Saturday) but during the weekdays, crime is occurring from 9 am to 5 pm (Appendix B).

Information Specific to Each of the Three Hot Spot Areas

Hot spot #1

Hot spot #1 is located in the Heritage Hills/Windsor Hills Combined Neighborhood Planning Area and the North Lamar Combined Neighborhood Planning Area. The boundaries are currently defined as:

- **North**
Interstate Highway 35 (on the west side) properties that front Rundberg
Interstate Highway 35 (on the east side) Northcape Drive street line
- **South**
Interstate Highway 35 (on the west side) Hackberry street line
Interstate Highway 35 (on the east side) East Rundberg street line
- **East**
Dallum street line
- **West**
North Creek property line

Interstate Highway 35 stretches from Laredo, Texas (at the American-Mexican border) to Duluth, Minnesota, passing through the middle of Hot spot #1. State, Federal Police and Austin Police suspect that this highway, IH35, is a major artery of contraband primarily illegal drugs and human trafficking moving north from Mexico and illegal guns and drug money moving to Mexico. This hot spot is a defining area for Restore Rundberg as it is the gateway into the neighborhood and at the same time an ideal hub for criminals needing to move quickly in and out of the area during the commission of violent and property related crimes. For decades, this highly trafficked and congested intersection has become the “go to” area for drugs and prostitution for residents of the Austin area and travelers alike. The high levels of foot and vehicle traffic make the land underneath and around the highway overpass popular for panhandlers. While there are several apartment complexes on the east side, much of the land is populated with commercial properties – inexpensive hotels and motels, gas stations, convenience stores, smoke shops, pawn shops and fast food restaurants. A 25-acre plot of undeveloped land lies just north of the northwest curb line of Rundberg and IH35. This plot of land is an extremely difficult area to police due to thick brush and poor vehicle access. The wooded area is used as a habitation for the homeless, drug dealers and prostitutes.

Four schools are located within the vicinity: Barrington and Guerrero Elementary Schools, Dobie Middle School, and Harmony Science Academy. Children walking to and from school must travel down the main street and cross under the freeway, passing drug deals, the homeless and prostitutes.

Hot spot #2

Hot spot #2 is in the North Lamar Combined Neighborhood Planning Area. The boundaries are currently defined as:

- **North**
Street line of John Nance Garner Circle
- **South**
East Powell Lane street line
- **East**
Open field just beyond property line of Sam Rayburn
- **West**
Property line of Sam Rayburn

Sam Rayburn Drive is a somewhat notorious block within the Rundberg neighborhood: single-family residences sit in a cul de sac on the north end; both sides are flanked with small four-plex rental units; and, a day care is situated at the far south end. The hot spot is backed by a vacant lot, primarily used by foot traffic from Powell to Rundberg Lane. Used condoms and drug paraphernalia line the street. Large dumpsters are on both sides of the street and it is not unusual to see junked couches, old rolls of carpet, sheetrock and mattresses sitting beside them. Many of the surrounding streets are single family homes. There are a few trash issues in the rest of the neighborhood, but the dumpsters in the hot spot are used by the community at large. Parking is haphazard and there appear to be more vehicles than parking spaces for some rental units. Graffiti and gang insignia are sprayed on the buildings and fences, and some of the apartments are in significant disrepair. Drugs and prostitution are serious problems on Sam Rayburn and are often the catalyst for the violent crime that occurs here. There is a large amount of pedestrian foot traffic on this street and it is used as a thoroughfare from the hotels on IH35 to Rundberg Lane. The children who live in this neighborhood attend Barrington Elementary, Dobie Middle School and Lanier High School.

Hot spot #3

Hot spot #3 is located in the North Austin Civic Association Planning Area. The boundaries are currently defined as:

- **North**
Rundberg property line
- **South**
North of GAMA property line
- **East**
Galewood Drive property line
- **West**
All properties that front Northgate

This hot spot encompasses a residential area, primarily apartment complexes and a few four-plexes. The very high turnover within the low cost housing contributes to the consistently high

violent and property crime rates. There are 2 liquor store type establishments within the hotspot that appear to be magnets for drug trafficking and related crimes. Dark, vacant properties are used by prostitutes and serve as congregation areas for the criminal element. The vacant properties and surrounding areas have overgrown landscaping, which provide cover, and are littered with used condoms, needles, and drug paraphernalia.

Implementation Activities and Logistics

The research team, comprised of University and City personnel, will:

- Continue to collect crime, census, observational, and qualitative data with constant analysis and re-analysis of impact, effectiveness and necessary refinement;
- Continue to examine the community's perceptions of crime, through dialogue, focus groups, correspondence, surveys and all other available means;
- Study displaced and/or disrupted crime;
- Likely implement a survey of hot spot residents to assess collective (community) efficacy and general feelings of safety and well-being in the hot spots; and,
- Create a list and layered mapping to track known offenders, review reports and intelligence, and organize information.

Based on the challenges experienced with data collection and analysis during the planning year, the City will require new report inputs for all crimes within the hot spot areas. Now that we have identified the "where," the new data requirements should allow the cross-sector partnership to: better understand who and what causes the systemic problems; identify and connect crime-related triggers; explain police successes vs. short comings; assist refining and enhancing crime solutions; and, provide improved prevention/intervention education for the community.

The research team meets weekly, typically by phone, and will continue to schedule in-person meetings as needed. The University will continue to present regular BCJI updates to the City and Rundberg Revitalization Team.

Innovative Crime Solutions and Complimentary Social Services Programming

Develop a strategy that offers a continuum of approaches to address the drivers of crime, including enforcement, prevention, intervention, and revitalization strategies.

Offer ongoing community engagement and leadership building support, and ensure the community is engaged in the process.

Implement a comprehensive and coordinated strategy with support from the BCJI TTA provider.

Strategy

The City and University will implement recommended strategies in collaboration with project partners and ensure that all strategies include community engagement components. The cross-sector partnership will continue to work with LISC and other TTA providers to implement evidence based policies and practices.

COPS Collaboration Toolkit, BJA Guidance for Building Communities of Trust (2011 BJA publication), Building Our Way Out of Crime, the Transformative Power of Police-Community Developer Partnerships (2010 COPS guide), and Overcoming Language Barriers: Solutions for Law Enforcement (2007 COPS guide).

Research, Recommendations, Implementation Activities and Logistics

The University considered many potential innovative crime solutions over the planning period and developed several comprehensive strategies. In addition to the data analysis described in the first section of this document, the following activities completed by the research team were an integral part of the process:

- Performed document analysis of information collected from planning meetings, neighborhood plans, community agencies, crime statistics, demographic analyses and historical documents
- Reviewed and discussed the three Austin City Council-adopted neighborhood plans with community leaders, to include the
 - North Lamar Combined Neighborhood Plan
 - North Austin Civic Association Neighborhood Plan
 - Heritage Hills/Windsor Hills Combined Neighborhood Plan
- Conducted interviews with police personnel, city partners, community members and community agency representatives
- Completed a comprehensive literature review of place-based crime prevention and community engagement strategies
- Completed approximately 30 hours of direct observations of the crime hotspots

CAN, a community action group, recently worked with representatives from the neighborhoods and other community and social service groups on place-based and safety net projects. CAN also

undertook a SWOT analysis of community engagement in the area and confirmed challenges of engaging recent immigrant and non-English speaking residents.

During the planning year, APD and the University held many individual, small and large group meetings with the community and stakeholders. The top identified persistent crime issues included drug trafficking and prostitution; burglary and theft (including homes, schools, cars and businesses); labor and sex trafficking; problem properties and code violations; gangs; public indecency; and elements of disorder (litter, poor upkeep of properties, vacant lots, used condoms and drug paraphernalia). Those who participated in the meetings, homeowners and renters alike, expressed the desire for permanent crime solutions in the interest of social and economic wellbeing. The overall vision of the community is described in each plan. The Heritage Hills/Windsor Hills Plan explains, “Neighborhood safety is an important indicator of a community’s overall economic and social well-being, which is why neighborhood crime prevention efforts are essential. Safe neighborhoods promote feelings of well-being, civic pride, and improve the quality of life of a community. Criminal activity if left unchallenged by the community, contributes to not only to increased neglect and diminished security, but decreased property values.” Dr. David Kirk with the University’s Department of Sociology completed a broad analysis of the area, examining the challenges of increasing efficacy while faced with high crime, properties in disrepair, and the lack of funds or willingness to make needed improvements (Appendix C).

After taking all applicable information into consideration, the University is confident that the proposed solutions will lead to sustainable reductions in crime and better position the neighborhood for investment and success with revitalization efforts over the long term. Consistent with the research to support community-based policing, APD will implement innovative policing approaches within the three identified hot spots as well as the BCJI-defined Rundberg Neighborhood. Within the three hot spot locations, the University recommends that APD:

- Employ a mobile walking beat
- Improve community engagement efforts
 - Enhance the community marketplace
 - Coordinate an apartment/landlord coalition
 - Hire a community engagement specialist to assist with a well-defined list of activities.

Recognizing that 30% of the BCJI target area is comprised of youth under the age of 17, and that the vast majority are described as low income and at risk, the University recommends an overarching focus on juvenile justice. This approach will help address many of the issues that currently exist while building the infrastructure needed to provide youth with better options to become positive contributors to this area and avoid criminal options.

The City and University will utilize Sherman et al.’s (1998) evidence-based approach to guide program development and implementation. Using Sherman’s refined Triple-T strategy of policing (2013), we will *target*, *test* and *track* the impact of our efforts.

Triple-T: Targeting, Testing, and Tracking.

1. Police should conduct and apply good research to *target* their scarce resources on predictable concentrations of harm from crime and disorder.
2. Once they choose their high-priority targets, police should review or conduct *tests* of police methods to help choose what works best to reduce harm.
3. Once police agencies use research to *target* their *tested* practices, they should generate and use internal evidence to *track* the daily delivery and effects of those practices, including the publicly-perceived legitimacy of policing. (Sherman, 2013, p. 5).

The proposed innovative strategies are also in line with the IMPROVE model (Uchida, Swatt, Solomon, & Varano, 2013): **I**nvestigate the Problem; **M**icro-target the Intervention; **P**rovide Space (Targeting Hot Spots); **R**estore Anchor Points (Revitalization); **O**rganize the Community; **E**ncourage Volunteerism; and **E**valuate.

Operation Mobile Walking Beat

Research shows that walking beats are effective when targeting particular hotspots, as opposed to random foot patrols (Sherman, 2013). Foot patrols improve the community's perception of police and significantly reduce fear of crime (Kellin, 1981) and the increased visibility of police acts as an overall deterrence to crime (Ratcliffe, Taniguchi, Groff & Wood, 2011). It is our hypothesis that foot and bike patrol, if structured properly, can be used as a community engagement tool as well as an enforcement mechanism. While the research on walking beats has been somewhat mixed, most recent research indicates they can be particularly effective when targeting hot spots as opposed to random foot patrols (Sherman, 2013). In cities like Philadelphia, foot patrols are showing promising results.

Police will be trained to better engage the community while on patrol by keeping track of their informal conversations with residents, business owners and commuters around their perceptions of the neighborhood, crime issues and daily occurrences. They will be tasked with making connections with business owners/workers, residents, and children in the area as well as spotting out crime and suspicious activity. These activities which are "community-intensive" will enable police to learn informal community influential/leaders to further community engagement. APD will be responsible for the logistical operation of the walking beat but the researchers will work in cooperation with APD to train police and develop evaluation tools to track community engagement and monitor crime. Initial training will take place during months 1 and 2 of implementation and follow-up instruction will occur throughout the two-year period.

Mobile walking beat operations will typically consist of 6-8 officers and one sergeant, with the ability to target multiple hot spots during one shift or one hot spot for a longer period of time. Officers assigned to district representative, metro tactical, patrol, and other sworn units will be scheduled for these overtime and regular-duty assignments, up to four 6-hour shifts per week. Additional personnel may be added for transportation purposes as needed. The advantage of the beat's mobility is that the supervisor can move the walking beat from one hot spot to another or into surrounding areas based on the needs of the moment. Such tactics give the impression of a

larger force and provide more visibility. This model, if successful, may be replicated around the city as a cost effective way to address place-based problems.

The shifting around of times at hot spots will be random although data will be collected on criminal activity to ensure the targeting of times and places as well as any displacement that may occur due to the increased police presences. The researchers will monitor mobile walking beat activities with the help of APD crime data, regular meetings with police on the beat, and daily activity sheets. Information to be collected during a shift will include requests for improvements of physical conditions, actual enforcement interventions, arrests, personal/non-crime assistance provided, and number of interactions (non-crime related). Officers will document the place and time of each interaction and descriptions of the community members with whom they interact. Data collected from the walking beat will track not only the impact on criminal activity but also will feed into community engagement in terms of informing the community engagement specialist and potential partners of needed physical improvements and services. Once the community organizer is hired, she/he will meet with walking beat reps biweekly to discuss overlap and potential areas for targeted outreach as well as tracking efforts to improve community engagement and trust with police and other governmental groups.

Community Engagement

As explained in the first section of this plan, the areas of focus for community engagement – the hot spot locations and greater BCJI area – are highly populated by immigrants, refugees, and non-English speaking individuals. This is one neighborhood of many across the United States with an invisible population, living in the United States, but not part of the larger community. The racial makeup of the neighborhood is diverse, including Hispanic, Vietnamese, Black or African American, White, Latin American, Asian, American Indian, Middle Eastern, and Pacific Islander. Approximately 64% of the population speak a language other than English, and of those individuals, 37% speak English very well and 63% less than very well. Spanish is the predominant language.

Over the decades, the Austin Police Department has been unsuccessful in reaching out to the diverse populations of the Rundberg area. Traditional policing has not reduced the consistently high violent and property crime rates. Police officers have not been able to identify the true leaders within the immigrant and refugee communities, a problem that has left community engagement and capacity building efforts at a disadvantage. The BCJI ideals and the federally-funded technical assistance offered creates a rare opportunity for the City, one that we expect to result in greater community efficacy and reduced crime. If our efforts are successful, we will begin to see increased participation in civic life and higher education.

Theorists of community engagement posit that communities with a high degree of efficacy experience lower crime rates (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999; Putnam, 2001). Community efficacy as well as another common concept of social relatedness, social capital, refers to the degree to which people trust their neighbors to provide a sense of safety, and to intervene if something problematic happens. This, combined with social cohesion (i.e., the sense of community shared by individuals in a neighborhood), helps decrease crime rates and creates a community approach to policing which can have a significant impact on areas with poor

trajectories in terms of crime and overall disorder (Uchida, Swatt, Solomon, & Varano, 2013). We build on the Institute for Community Peace (as documented by Bowen, Gwiasda and Brown's, 2004) theory of change to mobilize the community from within to address persistent crime issues. We believe that for real community engagement to occur, someone from within the community with a perceived legitimacy and connection to the people living within the hot spots is needed. We assert that proper support is required to allow for community engagement – financial, technical and evaluation assistance – and that capacities and skills will need to be developed to affect change. This is not a quick solution or process, but the idea behind the strategy is to build a foundation for greater community engagement over time, particularly since demographic data shows that the people living in the hot spots represent the fastest growing population in the Rundberg area.

This year, we will administer a survey (see Appendix D) with the assistance of graduate students at the University's School of Social Work. There are at least two graduate classes that will help with this effort – one that focuses on engagement of Hispanic populations, and a second that focuses on strategic partnerships and collaborations. Some of the students are bilingual and the survey is in Spanish, but has also been translated into English. The survey will give us baseline data and we will re-administer the survey at the end of year three to assess the impact of our innovative strategies. As we prepare to roll out this survey and engage the residents of the hot spots, we will be relying on the technical assistance provided by the Department of Justice and its partners, particularly the representative from the VERA Institute of Justice.

Restore Rundberg Marketplace

Part of community engagement is to establish a marketplace. Providing a social network for the community, within the neighborhood, through which participants learn and gain resources may allow many problems to be stopped before a crime occurs. The benefits of a social network approach are many: access to greater quantity, if not quality, of social capital through unrepeated links or contacts and the networks is simultaneously strengthened. Clearly, social networks play a crucial role in how problems are solved, how social structures function, and the success of individual or community endeavors. The increased closeness of the links between participants' signals greater commitment to and involvement with the process of reaching the desired outcome: "Members' mutual feelings of trust, openness, belonging, shared commitment, and common values provide the foundation for mutual learning among diverse members... This sense of community is at the heart of communities' success." (Synder & Souza Briggs, 2007). As Putnam notes (1993, 1995), participation, association and the exchange of information are key indicators of social well-being as they promote collective standards and trust.

During the planning year, the APD district representative officers began hosting a weekly Tuesday night meeting at the YMCA, which recently evolved into the Restore Rundberg Marketplace. The marketplace is an opportunity for the community to dialogue, network, receive information, and make connections to address their social, environmental, health and financial needs. The marketplace structure is fairly tentative but meetings are consistently held at 6:00 p.m., same place and location weekly, remain informal, and officers are beginning to develop good relationships with those who do not typically attend community meetings. Weekly attendance averages between 15 and 25, and is expected to increase over time. Starting in

February 2014, one meeting per month will focus on a particular problem within the community as identified by participants. Marketplace topics may include immigrant welcome and informational sessions; assistance with gaining valid identification; code enforcement, tenant and landlord rights; City resources; child safety and gang information; and, immigrant protection from wage theft. Initially, the monthly meetings are expected to draw 30 to 40 participants, possibly more as word spreads.

The Restore Rundberg Marketplace is open to all members of the public. The YMCA has adequate parking and is within walking distance for some. There are multiple bus routes to this location (142, 325, 1M, and 481). The marketplace will be advertised using community member and associations, TV and radio outlets, social media, schools, and other available resources.

Immigrant and Refugee Outreach

The Austin Police Department and other public safety agencies within Austin strive to be respected and trusted by all segments of the community's diverse population. Refugee and immigrant safety education and dialogue over the long term will allow for the most efficient use of public safety resources and will lead to a better quality of life for all – regardless of place of origin or resident status. APD currently partners with local non-profit organizations to offer informal refugee and immigrant safety education in central locations of the city. The University recommends the implementation of this form of education within the Restore Rundberg Marketplace and will work with APD, LISC, the Vera Institute and the community to modify the curriculum prior to implementation. In general, the public safety class is grounded in a social network approach, with participants learning about their rights and responsibilities within the U.S. legal system. The goals of this activity will be to reduce the likelihood of immigrants and refugees becoming victims or perpetrators of crime and to increase the opportunities for public safety employees to interact with Austin's immigrant and refugee communities. Education will generally take the form of orientation sessions in which police officers, other public safety representatives, community service providers and fellow community members will meet with immigrants and refugees in a safe, non-threatening environment. The focus will be as much on developing trust and a climate of positive two-way communication as it is on delivering content.

Benefits of the community meetings:

- Participants will be empowered by receiving information, in their own language, that is vital to their decision making process, the re-creation of their identity and self-sufficiency.
- Interacting with uniformed officers will help participants overcome barriers they may have due to prior experiences in their home country or in the United States.
- The marketplace promotes collective standards, trust and an understanding of the “common good.”

Apartment/Landlord Coalition

All three hotspots have a concentration of low rent housing, from duplexes and four-plexes to larger 100+ unit apartment complexes. The majority of occupants are recent immigrants, refugees, Hispanic and non-English speakers who are not looking to make the area their permanent home. There is a high degree of turnover of occupants as well as apartment/landlord

management personnel. Persistent criminal activity is occurring in and around these units. The occupants and management personnel, including many families with young children, do not typically engage in the planning and revitalization processes.

Over the last couple of years, efforts to work with renters and management have been very challenging. Some success has been realized working with business owners and landlords but officers are experiencing difficulty organizing and regularly interacting with residents and the majority of management personnel.

The University recommends that APD district representative officers reinitiate and take the lead in coordinating an apartment/landlord coalition within each of the hot spot areas. The coalitions will act as mechanisms to organize stakeholders – landlords, residents and community partners – and address criminal activity, physical issues and social services within their immediate areas. To build capacity, the resources of the marketplace should be leveraged and apartment/landlord management personnel and community members should receive leadership training. Logistics specific to these activities will be developed by APD and the University in cooperation with stakeholders over the next few months.

Community Engagement Specialist/Organizer

The community engagement and police approach is largely about capacity building. The University recommends that APD hire a community engagement specialist to assist police working within the hot spot areas as well as the larger BCJI target area. The goal is to create a positive connection with the police that can begin to change what has historically been a strained relationship within the Rundberg community. This person must be an adept and experienced community organizer, bilingual or multi-lingual, and preferably, a member of the Rundberg community. The University will work with APD to develop the job description and expectations (including data collection and reporting), and will assist with hiring. Once the community engagement specialist is in place (mid-March 2014), APD and the researchers will meet regularly with him/her to discuss ongoing projects, developments and targeted programming and monitoring.

The community engagement specialist will likely co-locate with police about half of his/her time and maintain one or more satellite offices convenient to community members. Partnering with the police, the specialist can bring visibility and build foundations of trust. Because this is a new project, resources are limited, and the list of potential community engagement duties could keep several full-time staff members occupied for the years to come, the University highly recommends that the responsibilities of the community engagement specialist be well defined. Dr. Michael Lauderdale, a Professor with the University of Texas' School of Social Work, will act as mentor to the specialist. Dr. Lauderdale's unique knowledge of the history and cultural divides specific to the Rundberg area will give the engagement specialist insight not typically realized at the beginning of an assignment.

The community engagement specialist's primary duties will likely include:

- Track and manage asset and resource lists for the hot spot areas;

- Plan, develop and implement youth programs in cooperation with project partners to help facilitate community involvement;
- Facilitate public dialogues and consensus building to identify and resolve issues;
- Assist in organizing and leveraging community support and resources for the Restore Rundberg Marketplace, the apartment/landlord coalitions, and other BCJI public safety initiatives;
- Develop social maps of informal leaders and their linkages in the hot spot areas as a means to improve community efficacy/social capital;
- Act as a liaison for code compliance / nuisance abatement issues within the 3 identified hot spot areas and the greater BCJI target area

Measuring the impact of this largely behind the scenes work will be a challenge for the researchers. Researchers will measure the impact of this strategy using the baseline and follow-up community efficacy survey data; qualitative data from interviews, focus groups and community gatherings; and, ongoing monitoring of outreach initiatives undertaken by the community specialist.

It will require time to bring in the right person and allow him/her a chance to build relationships with the community. Guidance and technical assistance from LISC, the Vera Institute, and other providers will help the specialist effectively communicate and serve the needs of the Rundberg Neighborhood. The City will employ the specialist to work 40 hours per week for a 95-week period.

Juvenile Justice

The fastest growing demographic in the Rundberg area is the Hispanic population with concentrated growth in young children between the ages of birth to 9 years. We used student data provided by the local district's website and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to confirm numbers of school-age children and to assess the academic performance and success trajectory for youth in the area. We also spoke with school and agency representatives working with youth in the area to better understand issues of concern. Not surprising, the majority of youth in the area are considered "at-risk" given their socio-economic status, the presence of criminal/gang activity, poor school performance and high dropout rates.

Within the hot spot locations and the greater BCJI area, there is a need to create safe places for children and young people to develop and thrive. Research shows that prolonged exposure to crime creates trauma that can impact a child's life trajectory (Wood et al., 2002). Understanding that the hot spot model relies on a variety of components to address crime including increased arrests, situational and targeted prevention strategies and social services (Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2012), we have paired our approach with complementary social services aimed at youth. With thirty percent of the Rundberg population under the age of 17, focusing on this group makes sense in terms of demographics and as explained earlier, sustainability due to growth. In addition, we want to test the hypothesis that youth programs will bridge divides within the Rundberg community by focusing on children, a group that people are generally concerned about, that is large and growing, and that we believe will give us common ground in our efforts to engage parents. Youth-oriented social service programs are discussed in detail in later

sections. It is important to note that while we present a great deal of background information on youth programming, we are still in a capacity building phase for these services and will need to further pursue and develop our partnership with local schools before any definitive strategies are determined.

Social services are a necessary component of place-based policing. As our capacity builds, our partners will be engaged to help determine appropriate complementary outreach, specifically focused on youth and community-oriented programming (i.e., restorative justice). APD, the University, the Rundberg Revitalization Team, AISD, and local juvenile justice specialists will spend the next few months developing and finalizing a scope of work for this component. The below research and recommendations will assist with the process.

Research and Potential Youth Programming Options

If there is one constant finding in criminological research, it is that offending increases dramatically during adolescence. Consider that in 1980, the total resident population of the United States was 227 million. By 2000, it had increased to 282 million and by 2007 it climbed to 302 million, an increase of 33 percent compared with 1980 (Butts & Mears, 2011). Given that there is a rise in the youth population, and that crime increases among this age group, we must be thoughtful about ways to stop the cycle of violence that feeds the juvenile- to adult-pipeline in which so many youth and families are trapped.

Research on youth sent to state institutions has shown that youth incarceration predicts future criminal behavior more so than gang affiliation, weapons possession, and family dysfunction. Preventing adolescents from continuing a criminal lifestyle would save the taxpayers of Texas millions of dollars. Each teen prevented from becoming a career criminal (including future adult offenders) could save between 1.7 and 2.3 million dollars *per* youth.

Youth Crime


According to the latest U.S. Department of Justice report (Snyder, 2012), in the year 2010 police agencies throughout the United States made almost 1.7 million arrests of youths under the age of 18. As documented by the FBI, children and youths accounted for about 14% of all arrests and an estimated 18% of all arrests for violent crimes in 2010. While juvenile crime is a prevalent social and public health problem, the violent crime index offenses—murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—peaked in 1994 and have steadily declined over the past 16 years. Despite this steady decline, juvenile delinquency continues to be a serious and costly problem in the United States.

Shifting Demographics of Texas

Texas has undergone a shift in population demographics that demographers expect to continue over the next several years. Today, less than half (45%) of the Texas population is Anglo, over one-third (38%) is Hispanic, and nearly 12 percent is African American. To examine such rates of disproportionality in the Texas juvenile justice system, Dr. Dottie Carmichael and her colleagues at the Texas A&M Institute for Policy Analysis examined differential rates of referral and progression through the juvenile justice system (see Figure 2).

Using existing databases from the Texas Education Agency and the former Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, virtually every Texas school child enrolled in grades 8 to 12 during the 1999 school year was monitored for juvenile justice involvement over a five-year period. They found that compared to Anglos, Hispanic juveniles have a significantly higher likelihood of progressing through all four stages of case processing from initial contact through court action (see Figure 2). African American youth have a higher likelihood of progressing through the first two stages, initial contact and prosecutorial referral. Dr. Carmichael and her colleagues concluded that efforts should be targeted toward minimizing the number of minority youth in high-risk categories. In other words, resources should be invested in prevention or early intervention programs to reduce involvement of minorities in school delinquency, enhance academic performance, support economically disadvantaged families, and develop effective interventions for juveniles with emotional or learning disabilities.

Figure 2. Multi-Stage Model of Progression through the Texas Juvenile Justice System²



This critical issue of minority youth being overrepresented in the Texas juvenile justice system will only be amplified in the years to come if we do not change the entry of youth of color into the system. The Texas State Data Center projects that the majority of Texans by 2020 will be Hispanic, and that Hispanics will account for over 50 percent of all Texans by 2040. This is certainly true of the Rundberg area with its ever increasing youth population. We must alter the pipeline from the juvenile justice to the adult criminal justice system for all youth, and especially for youth of color, through prevention and early intervention programs.

² Source: Carmichael, D., Whitten, G., & Voloudakis, M. (2005). *Study of minority over-representation in the Texas juvenile justice system*. Submitted to the Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division. Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University.

Capacity Building: Plans for Youth-Oriented Social Services

The research team will use the APD crime database to track trends in crime in the Rundberg area. The research team is also in the process of analyzing juvenile crime trends and statistics in the Rundberg area. The details of how social service programs for youth will be determined is still largely in development. Although parameters of focus for the services are noted below, social services for youth is an area of funding for the grant in which community engagement through cooperation and partnering is key. We are currently working to build a model for designing and implementing programs in the schools. The research partner will be responsible for setting up the model with the school district but the school district will ultimately be responsible for the implementation of the programs, with the researcher taking a more evaluative role. Because of the district's ability to track student level data and to couple that with local and state crime data, the researcher will work with the district to design data management tools that can help evaluate the efficacy of any youth-based programming arising from the grant.

Risk and Protective Factors

Early efforts aimed at intervening during an adolescent's initial involvement with the system have been developed to reduce the likelihood that a youth will re-enter the system. Many prevention-focused approaches utilize an ecological framework to identify the presence of risk and protective factors that influence the likelihood that a youth will engage in delinquency (Fraser & Terzian, 2005; Hawkins & Weis, 1985; Kirby & Fraser, 1997). *Risk factors* refer to individual and contextual characteristics that increase the risk of developing problems with delinquency. *Protective factors* refer to characteristics that act as buffers to protect against the risk of delinquency (Fraser & Terzian, 2005; Kirby & Fraser, 1997).

Research using a risk and protection approach has contributed much to our understanding of potential pathways to juvenile delinquency. Although no single path to delinquency exists, research shows a positive relationship between risk of juvenile offending and a number of risk factors and risk factor domains (Kirby & Fraser, 1997; Wasserman et al., 2003). Youth with multiple risk factors over the course of their lifetime are more likely to experience a *cumulative risk effect* that increases their risk for delinquency involvement (Kirby & Fraser, 1997). In addition, the interaction of risk factors, a multiplicative effect when several risk factors are present, and the way that certain protective factors may work to offset risk factors are necessary considerations when addressing the problem of juvenile delinquency. While some juvenile offenders may share common risk factors, the patterns and particular combination of risk factors vary from juvenile to juvenile. Therefore, efforts aimed at reducing or preventing delinquency necessitate knowledge of relevant risk and protective factors as well as an understanding of the unique and complex relationships between them.

Acknowledging the presence of risk factors is important to understanding an adolescent's likelihood for engaging in delinquency. However, equal consideration should be given to the contribution of protective factors in reducing the probability of developing problem behaviors associated with risk factors. In line with the ecological perspective, protective factors also exist and interact across multiple domains of an adolescent's life (Kirby & Fraser, 1997). The exact definition of protective factors varies, with some viewing protective factors as the opposite or absence of risk. However, a well-accepted and highly used definition of protective factors is that

they are resources that serve as a buffer to interact with or moderate the exposure to risk (Jenson & Fraser, 2006; Kirby & Fraser, 1997).

Although the risk of juvenile offending is dependent on the number of risk factors a youth experiences, the number of protective factors is also highly influential in determining whether or not a youth engages in delinquency (Loeber & Farrington, 2000). Many individuals may experience a high number of risk factors without engaging in delinquent activity due to the presence of protective factors that mitigate the risk (Hawkins et al., 1992; Hawkins, Kosterman, Catalano, Hill, & Abbott, 2005; Kirby & Fraser, 1997; Williams, Ayers, & Arthur, 1997).

From an ecological perspective, child and adolescent development occurs as a result of the complex interplay among individual and contextual influences across the lifespan (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). These areas of influence, or domains, consist of individual, family, peer, community, and school characteristics and experiences. Risk and protective factors may be present in one or more of these domains and multiple factors may exist within a single domain. Assessing risk and protective factors across these multiple domains offers insight into possible levels of individual vulnerability to delinquency involvement and provides guidance for developing strategies for delinquency prevention.

While risk and protective factors can be discussed and measured at these various levels – individual, family, peer, community, and school – the research team’s focus will remain at the school and community levels. The programs and interventions being considered for the Restore Rundberg Initiative are primarily at the school and community levels, so it seems methodologically sound to measure impact primarily at these levels.

Community Factors: The neighborhood environment can exert substantial influence on a child’s life. Studies have found that children raised in disadvantaged neighborhoods are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior (De Coster, Heimer, & Wittrock, 2006; Wasserman et al., 2003). However, the mechanism of neighborhood disadvantage and how it affects child development is a little more complex. Neighborhoods with high rates of crime and delinquency may model negative, delinquent behavior for a child (Haynie, Silver, & Teasdale, 2006; Jencks & Mayer, 1990). In other words, a child who often witnesses violence and crime in his or her neighborhood may begin to believe in the efficacy of the use of violence and poor conflict resolution skills to deal with one’s problems. Others have taken a developmental perspective and suggest the conceptualization of neighborhood and the amount of contact a young child has is minimal and therefore the community domain may not be a salient factor for a young child. However, as children grow older, their perception of and contact with neighborhood expands, and effects become more direct (Aber, Gephart, Brooks-Gunn, Connell, & Spencer, 1997; Ingoldsby & Shaw, 2002).

Adolescents living within high-crime neighborhoods are often subjected to greater risks and feelings of danger, which may lead to feeling a need to protect oneself. This sense of self-protection may then lead to engaging in delinquency (Fite et al., 2012). For example, the National Survey of Children’s Exposure to Violence purports that more than one in five 14- to 17-year-olds (22.2%) had witnessed a shooting in the previous year (Finkelhor, Turner, Ormrod, Hamby, & Kracke, 2009). Liberman (2007) found that adolescents’ exposure to firearm violence

approximately doubled the probability that an adolescent would commit serious violence over the subsequent two years. The findings of this study suggest that the strongest predictor of carrying a concealed gun for adolescents was a perception of safety in the neighborhood (Lieberman, 2007).

School Factors: Poor academic performance, specifically in elementary grades, has been linked to later delinquent behavior (Hawkins et al., 2000). In addition, high rates of truancy in elementary and middle school have been linked to increased rates of violent behavior in adolescence (Hawkins et al., 2000; Wasserman et al., 2003). It seems logical that a child who is missing a lot of school would also have poor academic performance; however, some see these factors as a subsequent development of additional domains of risk factors (Loeber & Farrington, 2000). In other words, poor academic performance and truancy may be a manifestation of something much more complex.

School engagement and school bonding, often used interchangeably, have received quite a bit of attention as a potential risk factor. School engagement can be conceptualized as a student's "active participation in school and classroom activities and a concomitant feeling of identification with school" (Finn, 1989, p. 123). Students' related feelings and experiences include attachment, commitment, and a sense of belonging. School bonding has been defined in terms of two primary and interdependent components: "attachment, characterized by close affective relationships with those at school; and commitment, characterized by an investment in school and doing well in school" (Catalano, Haggerty, Oesterle, Fleming, & Hawkins, 2004, p. 252). Several studies have examined school bonding and school engagement and have found that students who are engaged in delinquent behavior have lower perceived levels of school bonding and school engagement (Crooks et al., 2007; Hawkins et al., 2000; Wasserman et al., 2003). One study examined the mediating effects of school engagement in the relationship between maltreatment and delinquency and found that children who were at greater risk of maltreatment were significantly more disengaged at school, and school disengagement predicted higher initial delinquency (Bender, 2012). Considering the tumultuous home environment that is most likely present for maltreated children, it is not surprising that they would have difficulty engaging in their school environments.

School climate and school safety have also been linked to school engagement or bonding. Some school policies, such as zero-tolerance policies, have raised concerns that they may not have the intended consequences the proponents had claimed. Zero-tolerance policies and out-of-school suspension policies were enacted to make schools safer and create a better learning climate. The results of one longitudinal study suggest the frequent use of out-of-school suspension had no measurable positive deterrent or academic benefit to either the students who are suspended or to non-suspended students. In fact, the use of out-of-school suspension with elementary-school and middle-school students predicted future suspensions, poor academic performance, and failing to graduate on time (Mendez, 2003). For adolescents, schools represent a highly influential environment for social development because of the heightened importance of peer groups during the developmental period of adolescence. As such, individual schools, and their culture and climate, may contribute additional risk and protection for juvenile delinquency.

School attachment and bonding may also act as protective factors for youth at risk of juvenile justice involvement. Feelings of belonging and attachment to school have been associated with positive developmental outcomes for youth. For example, a study by Catalano, Haggarty, Oesterle, Fleming, and Hawkins (2004) found that youth who felt more investment in school and experienced closer attachments to those in the school environment were more likely to be academically successful and less likely to exhibit less problematic behaviors, such as substance use, high-risk sexual behavior, and use of violence.

Implications of Adopting a Risk and Protective Factor Framework: Approaching the problem of juvenile delinquency through the lens of risk and protection has resulted in many advances in the development of prevention interventions. A risk and protection perspective implies that the most effective prevention programs should seek to reduce possible risk factors and enhance protective factors in order to reduce the likelihood of juvenile offending.

The wealth of evidence supporting the utility of addressing risk and protective factors for the prevention of juvenile delinquency provides a compelling argument for using this evidence in practice with children and youth. Using the ecological framework to identify characteristics that are influential for youth across individual, family, peer, school, and community domains can be useful in guiding current intervention practice. However, it is important to remember that the presence of risk alone does not determine whether or not a youth will exhibit delinquent behaviors or become a juvenile offender. Practitioners working with children and youth to prevent delinquency must consider the number of risks a youth experiences, the type of risks involved, the number and type of domains that provide the risk, the developmental stage of the youth, the youth's gender and race or ethnicity, and, most importantly, the presence of protective factors that work to reduce the likelihood of these risk factors.

In all but the most severe or dangerous cases, youthful offenders should be treated in their communities and preferably while they live at home and continue to attend school. The recommendations below are driven by this philosophy and supporting research.

Emphasize Community-based Services for Youth

Community-based services (e.g., school- and faith-based programs, community policing, children and family services) are more effective and less costly than incarceration. Research has demonstrated that the juvenile justice system, while empowered to arrest, prosecute, punish, and even incapacitate offenders, is grossly inadequate to alone address the complex mechanisms that contribute to sustained juvenile offending behavior. Juvenile justice practitioners have begun to embrace models of collaboration, often called “wraparound” services (Pullmann, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor, & Sieler, 2006), multimodal, integrated, or comprehensive models of intervention that involve collaboration between the major systems that a youth encounters, such as mental health, substance abuse services, medical services, child welfare services, and the education system (Cocozza, Skowrya, & Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention, 2000; Hartford, Carey, & Mendonca, 2006; McCarter, Haber, & Kazemi, 2010; Osher, Steadman, & Barr, 2003; Suter & Bruns, 2009; Wilson & Draine, 2006). True collaboration requires more than just working together or having open lines of communication. Collaboration must include role clarification, clear professional boundaries, an understanding of the collaborators' professional training, and working toward agreed-upon goals.

In a review of research on community-based interventions, Howell (1995) found community programs such as group homes and day reporting centers to be more effective than traditional correctional programs at reducing recidivism and improving community adjustment, even for violent adolescent offenders. In a meta-analysis conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006), one community-based treatment program – Multisystemic Therapy - was found to reduce juvenile recidivism by 10.5% resulting in benefits to crime victims (of the reduction in crime) of \$12,855 and benefits to taxpayers of \$9,622.

Prioritize Youth Education and School Retention

The importance of education opportunities for court involved youth cannot be overstated. Academic competence and educational attainment is inversely correlated with re-arrests and re-offending among youth.

Dr. Dottie Carmichael and her colleagues (2005) at the Texas A&M Institute for Policy Analysis found that one school disciplinary report is the most powerful predictor of future delinquency offenses in Texas. Furthermore, a recent study by Dr. Soyong Jung (2007) revealed that African American high-school students are approximately 3 times more likely and Hispanic students are 2 times more likely to receive an internal school suspension compared to White students (even after adjusting for gender and socioeconomic status).

There is a clear nexus between school failure and school exclusion and the increased risk for a youth's involvement in juvenile corrections. Nationally, data suggest that while school violence has remained relatively constant and/or has declined since 1995, the rate at which students are excluded from school via suspensions and/or expulsions has increased dramatically. Youth who are subject to increased numbers of disciplinary infractions are disproportionately minority students and students enrolled in special education programs. Some attribute this to “zero tolerance” policies that sweep up kids involved in serious disciplinary infractions, as well as youth whose transgressions in the past were handled by the assistant principal.

Adopt a Restorative Justice Philosophy in Working with Youth

Restorative justice for juvenile offenders is a community-based approach to juvenile justice that acknowledges that most low-risk youth are better served in the community and are better served through diversion programs that avoid traditional juvenile justice processing. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP, 2012) found that restorative justice programs (like Victim Offender Mediation [VOM]) were associated with a significant reduction in recidivism and were relatively inexpensive (Lee, Aos, Drake, Pennucci, Miller, & Anderson, 2012). WSIPP calculated that the cost per participant was for \$579 for VOM. Further, the report calculated that in nearly all cases, the benefits of most restorative justice programs outweigh its costs. Their findings in 2006 led WSIPP to promote restorative justice programs in juvenile courts as “evidence-based investment opportunities available to . . . policymakers” (Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006, p. 12). Restorative justice programs are cost-effective interventions for low-risk offenders that hold juveniles accountable for their behaviors while offering a more empowering, community-based resolution than traditional juvenile justice programs and should be part of a continuum of interventions that we consider.

Neighborhood Accountability Boards, one restorative justice program, is reviewed below and could be considered for adoption in the Rundberg area.

Exhibit 1: Brief Overview of Restorative Justice³

Restorative justice offers a different way of understanding and responding to crime. Instead of viewing the state as the primary one offended by criminal acts and placing the actual victims and the community, as well as offenders, in passive roles, restorative justice turns this arrangement around and recognizes crime as fundamentally directed against individual people. It is grounded in the belief that those most affected by crime should be the ones to be actively involved in resolving the conflict. Restorative justice is grounded in the following principles: (a) crime is a violation of a person by another person; (b) the harm suffered by victims must be paramount, and victims must be helped to move beyond their sense of vulnerability; (c) offenders must be encouraged to understand the harm they have caused and be given an opportunity to make amends; and (d) the community must be involved in holding the offender accountable, promoting a healing response to the needs of victims and offenders, and assuming responsibility for the social conditions that contribute to offender behavior. Although restorative justice denounces criminal behavior, it emphasizes the need to treat offenders with respect and to help them belong to their communities in ways that can promote lawful behavior.

Example: Neighborhood Accountability Boards

Neighborhood Accountability Boards (NAB) are citizen sentencing panels who meet with offenders to develop agreements that focus on victim and community, understanding of harm caused by their crime, and avoidance of future offending behavior (Bazemore, 2001). Offenders' families are encouraged to participate as well but NABs can proceed without either victim or family present. These accountability boards put greatest emphasis on the vital role of neighbors as problem solvers and supports for youth and families in trouble in the context of the neighborhood as the focus for decision-making. The ability of NABs to create change in offenders stems from the fact that the people who are concerned about them live in their community, have been parents themselves, can provide support to offenders' parents who struggle with discipline and other neighborhood influences on their children, and can provide monitoring and mentoring after the conference. Because these volunteers are unpaid, offenders, victims, and their families respect and value their input and the authenticity of the concern (Bazemore & Schiff, 2005).

³ The text in Exhibit 1 is excerpted from: Armour, M. P., & Umbreit, M. S. (2007). Victim-offender mediation and forensic practice. In D. W. Springer & A. R. Roberts (Eds.), *Handbook of forensic mental health with victims and offenders: Assessment, treatment, and research* (pp. 519-539). NY: Springer Publishing Co.

Most NABs take minor diversion cases. They affirm the connection to the neighborhood and start the discussion by telling a little about themselves. Boards are constrained in their process by a tradition of board members asking questions of the youth and then presenting recommendations. Consequently, communication may be more one-way. The purpose of preparatory meetings varies. In some cases, the face-to-face preparation is used to gather information on the offender to ensure the right mix of gender, personality, or other attributes among the volunteer citizens that can positively influence the youth. In Denver, the offender is given an asset assessment to develop an asset inventory of interests and skills board members can use in developing plans for community service placements or other activities as part of the agreement. This board also determines the offender's motivation or 'readiness for repair' by administering a victim empathy survey prior to final acceptance of the case and convening the official board meeting (Bazemore & Schiff, 2005).

A recent national survey found that NABs are the second most prevalent type of restorative program for juvenile offenders after VOM (Bazemore & Schiff, 2005). NABs may have the greatest potential for significant impact on the response of the formal system to nonviolent crime (Bazemore & Umbreit, 1999).

Community Resource Coordination Groups (CRCGs)

CRCGs, which were created by the 70th Texas Legislature in 1987, and reauthorized again through the 77th Legislature, have as their primary purpose to establish a system of interagency coordination of services to children and youth and their families (and now adults) who often "fall through the cracks" due to having complex needs that require coordination across multiple agencies. Child or youth-serving CRCGs are available to all 254 Texas counties, although adult-serving CRCGs are still being implemented around the state. While there is one CRCG model with guiding principles, each local CRCG is customized according to the resources within that community and the creativity of the members that serve on the group. The strength of this flexible network is evidenced by a number of CRCGs serving as a catalyst in developing a stronger systems-of-care that incorporates a wraparound services delivery approach for a youth and his or her family. Thus, these existing provider networks can be tapped to help divert youth from a restrictive juvenile justice settings or to re-integrate youth back into their community. Currently there are over 160 local CRCGs that include child and youth-serving CRCGs, adult-serving groups (CRCGAs), or a combined group that serves any age of individual and families (CRCGF). Of note, there is no dedicated state funding directed to the operation of local CRCGs, therefore, the success of this interagency process is contingent upon the leadership and innovation of the collective membership. According to 2006 data from the State Office of CRCGs, the highest rates of referrals into local CRCGs statewide are independent school districts followed by local juvenile probation departments. Thus, it is conceivable that CRCGs could also be used on the front-end to amplify diversion efforts.

It may be possible to coordinate efforts with the State Office of CRCG to establish a CRCGF for the Rundberg area. This may also serve as one mechanism for engaging non-English speaking parents around specific problems or challenges they are facing.

Youth Gangs: Prevention and Intervention

Results from the 2009 National Youth Gang Survey (NYGS) indicate that approximately 90% of gang members are males. However, the NYGS relies on official police reports, so differences in police responses to suspected gang members might influence these results. Self-report studies have typically found more female gang members (Bjerregaard & Smith, 1993; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1993; Maxson & Whitlock, 2002; Moore & Hagedorn, 2001), with up to as much as 38% of gang members being female (Esbensen & Winfree, 1998).

As discussed earlier, criminal activity is typically not randomly distributed but is highly concentrated in crime “hot spots” (Anselin, Cohen, Cook, Gorr, & Tita, 2000; Hipp, Tita, & Greenbaum, 2009; Sherman & Eck, 2002; Sherman, Gartin, & Buerger, 1989) and even “micro-locales” within neighborhoods (Steele, 2005, 2006). This is also the case for the presence of gang members and their criminal activities (e.g., Rosenfeld, Bray, & Egley, 1999; Tita, Cohen, & Engberg, 2005).

Strategically, anti-gang programs targeting defined gang-ridden neighborhoods are more likely to succeed than those attempting to produce change in a larger geopolitical area. Programs tailored to the conditions of a particular neighborhood, or even a smaller space such as a city block, have the potential to more intensively focus resources, adapt to the immediate cultural environment, and allow for more interaction between gang members, local residents, and those implementing the gang program (Steele, 2005, 2006).

There are various sociological and criminological theories that attempt to explain gang involvement. Community theories predict that neighborhoods suffering from disorganization and decay are more likely to have higher rates of crime due to physical and social deterioration, impoverishment, and instability that cause the loss of social cohesion and informal social control, and influx of those with criminal intentions. Conversely, neighborhoods prevent crime by strengthening social networks, empowering families, promoting prosocial opportunities, prohibiting delinquent peer groups, and improving community resources and government support.

More specifically, community empowerment theory emphasizes the importance of residents in neighborhood management. When citizens become involved in their community, they have a greater stake in its welfare and are willing to take responsibility for its quality of life. Residents develop deeper social networks, satisfaction in their ability to effect change, and a shared sense of mutual concern and collective efficacy (Bennett, 1998), which counteract criminal influences in the neighborhood. From a contextual perspective, programs that intervene with general community conditions such as poverty, unemployment, family instability, and health-related problems can have an indirect but powerful influence on gang-related delinquency and criminality.

Intervention Programs that Reduce Opportunities for Gang Activity: Intervention programs of this type are the most common, and most visible, strategies that criminal justice agencies use for dealing with gang crimes. One way to change the neighborhood social environment and consequent opportunity structure for gang activity is through the use of suppression tactics. Individual and collective gang-suppression programs increase the community tracking of gang members and law enforcement intelligence-gathering activities. Suppression can also involve efforts to enhance the detection and investigation of crimes in gang-ridden neighborhoods, the specialized prosecution of gang members, and imposition of sentencing enhancements for gang members. One strategy for suppressing gang crime is the removal of core gang members from the community. An example of gang member removal is Project Exile, a federal program with enhanced penalties for gun law offenses. Federal penalties for felons in possession of weapons, possession of illegal weapons, and other less common firearm offenses are greater than those in most states, are more likely to result in mandatory prison sentences, and often “exile” offenders to prisons far from their home community, effectively insulating the community from that particular core gang member (Rosenfeld, Fornagno, & Baumer, 2005).

Intervention Programs that Improve Community Resources: Programs in this category can be distinguished from prevention programs that target community resources in that the criminal behaviors of gang members can trigger changes in the orientations and dispositions of community members, alter the neighborhood context, and thus reduce gang activity in that area. A program that adopts this approach is the Community Critical Incident Review (CCIR) program. CCIR grew out of the “New Criminal Justice” approach (Klofas, Hipple, & McGarrell, 2010) that integrates crime research and analysis with community action to control crime. While criminal incident reviews have been implemented in various forms in many communities, participants are usually restricted to criminal justice professionals and other experts with the intention of developing strategic and tactical plans to mitigate emerging crime in a specific locale (Klofas et al., 2006), including gang-ridden neighborhoods (Braga, Pierce, McDevitt, Bond, & Cronin, 2008). CCIR is somewhat different in that it engages community residents immediately after a significant crime event has occurred to help in the police investigation by providing suspect and background information. They also are encouraged to cooperate with government agencies and neighborhood groups in implementing targeted crime-prevention activities within narrowly defined areas, such as an apartment complex or a city block (Steele, 2006). CCIR can contribute to other more general community partnerships to improve the community context and reduce crime, such as the Operation Weed and Seed projects that exist throughout the country (Dunworth, Mills, Cordner, & Greene, 1999).

Exhibit 2: Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT)

An exemplar prevention program that intends to change the traits and dispositions of juveniles who live in a community is Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT). A school-based program that has been provided to a broad range of middle-school students, GREAT deters youth from joining gangs, prevents violent and criminal behavior, and encourages positive relations with police officers. It consists of 13 classroom sessions taught by uniformed police officers and employs a cognitive-behavioral curriculum that teaches responsibility, nonviolent conflict resolution, goal

setting, cultural diversity, engaging with prosocial peers, and how one can meet one's social needs without joining a gang. Esbensen, Peterson, Taylor, and Osgood (2012) found that when GREAT was properly implemented, participants were 39% less likely to join a gang than students in a control group, when measured 1 year after the training, and 24% less likely 4 years after the training.

GREAT is currently being delivered by trained APD officers in some schools in the Rundberg area. We recommend that GREAT be delivered all schools in the Rundberg area.

Juvenile Gang Intervention Unit. It is worth noting that the Austin Police Department has secured additional funding from the Criminal Justice Division of the Texas Governor's Office. This effort is a coordinated activity with APD to extend and enhance gang prevention and rehabilitative efforts. The Austin Police Department has identified 98 known youth gang members in Austin, and some of these youth live in the Rundberg area. Dr. David Springer serves as the PI on this project, and he will lead a small team of expert consultants and interviewers to meet with as many of these 98 youth as possible. The purpose of the face-to-face interviews is three-fold:

1. Assess the pathways youth took to join the gangs.
2. Examine their experiences in the gangs.
3. Explore with each youth potential effective exit strategies out of the gangs, including education, training, and employment opportunities.

This project should augment the other youth-centered efforts underway as part of Restore Rundberg.

Neighborhood Planning and the Rundberg Revitalization Team

Establish effective partnerships both to provide solutions along the continuum and commit resources to sustain what works.

Enhance the Rundberg Revitalization Team with the presence of criminal justice, social service, and neighborhood revitalization partners.

Identify new and build upon existing planning efforts to revitalize the neighborhood and address issues that relate to the crime issues identified.

Strategy

Three Austin City Council-adopted plans are joined in this program. The cross-sector partnership will continue to work with the City Neighborhood Development and Review Department to complete activities that will move priority objectives forward.

The collaboration will rely on the City, University, and BCJI TTA to increase the knowledge and skills of Rundberg community leadership groups.

The Collaboration Toolkit for Community Organizations: Effective Strategies to Partner with Law Enforcement (2010 research-based COPS guide).

Rundberg Revitalization Team

The original Team included five members with the mission of ensuring that Rundberg crime solutions would include community engagement and the connections necessary to lead the area towards successful long-term revitalization.

Following a series of meetings with community leaders and engagement experts the following improvements were completed:


- The revitalization target area was expanded to encompass the entire area covered by the three council-adopted plans (Image 3)
- A draft community-driven revitalization structure was created
- The Rundberg Revitalization Team membership was increased, from 5 to 14 members

The Rundberg Revitalization Team acts in an advisory capacity for the Austin Police Department grant staff, with Team meetings providing regular forums for community discussion. In addition, the Team will guide Restore Rundberg revitalization efforts for the years to come. The specific responsibilities of Team members may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Attend monthly Rundberg Revitalization Team meetings
- Identify priority objectives within the three neighborhood plans
 - Identify short-term outcome measures
 - Identify long-term outcome measures
 - Use identified outcomes to define revitalization projects

- Work with neighborhood leaders and the community to collectively achieve objectives outlined in the three Rundberg neighborhood plans adopted by Austin City Council
 - Volunteer to assist with activities
 - Develop a resource and asset inventory for the 3-plan area
 - Assist with identifying opportunities for additional funding sources and in-kind donations to ensure the sustainability of the program
- Receive updates on the research and community engagement components and listen to community input
- Utilize the individual talents and associations of individual members of the Team to promote and advocate on behalf of the program
- Work with community stakeholders and City personnel to facilitate the smooth operation of funded and resourced projects within the Restore Rundberg Program Revitalization boundaries

Image 3



The Development and Sustainability Workgroup of volunteers will be composed of members and affiliates of the Rundberg Revitalization Team, community members, stakeholder groups, and subject matter experts – all with varying levels of responsibility. The work of the Development and Sustainability Workgroup may include the following functions:

- Assist the Team with documenting all known revitalization projects, conducting research to identify unknown efforts, and identifying any overlap

- Engage individuals/entities involved with existing revitalization projects
- Determine where those in control stand on Rundberg crime and social issues, identify stakeholders, and determine the best means to recruit each
- Identify the knowledge and skills needed to complete program activities, identify partners' knowledge and skills, identify gaps and provide corresponding training and technical assistance, and ensure that facilitation skills are present
- Pool language resources among project partners
- Identify, engage and train bilingual team members
- Provide ongoing and varied opportunities for community engagement
- Ensure that community members are ready to respond to a changing environment
- Train workgroup members to properly leverage resources and funding

The Development and Sustainability Workgroup will form committees to tackle specific priority objectives and related outcomes identified by the Team. The committees will be staffed by volunteers who join based on their expertise and/or willingness to take a leadership or hands-on role in completing project objectives and activities. The committees (also volunteers) will form their own meeting schedule and timelines. Committee leaders will act as liaisons to, and request assistance (as needed) from, the Team and Development and Sustainability Workgroup. After the Team identifies priority objectives and related outcomes, Committee responsibilities will be defined by the Committee itself, with assistance from the Workgroup. An indefinite number of Committees may be developed; however, the Team may merge or split Committees to improve the chances of success. Committee responsibilities may include:

- Create asset and resource inventories, document the capacities under neighborhood control, the resources within the community but outside of neighborhood control, and potential building blocks not located in the neighborhood and controlled by people outside of the community
- Identify stakeholders and secure support, seek out resources and in-kind donations
- Plan and implement community-driven activities within the revitalization area
- Create, maintain and expand volunteer base
- Report activity performance measures to the Workgroup on a monthly basis

The above structure is considered tentative. The Team is still working out the details and this document will be revised if necessary. Team members have committed to two monthly meetings: a Team meeting on the 2nd Thursday of each month and a community meeting on the 4th Thursday of each month. In January 2014, members began using Basecamp, an online project management tool, to share information and organize activities.

During the BCJI implementation years, the Team will likely focus their time and efforts on juvenile justice initiatives, including afterschool and mentoring programs; TABC alcohol permits within areas of concern; immigrant/refugee theft of service; code compliance/nuisance abatement; and, the construction of a senior center/health care facility within the Sam Rayburn hot spot.

Several community members and groups have expressed a desire to assist in organizing upcoming events and to lead activities. Michael DeLaFuente, a Financial Advisor with Wells

Fargo LLC, oversees a local leadership group that has agreed to assist with four of the Team's monthly community meetings (beginning in April). On a monthly basis, his leadership group will provide support for the Restore Rundberg Marketplace and assist with developing a history of the program. In addition, he is developing a "CEO for the day" program that will match promising Rundberg youth with successful local business executives to advance their interest in particular fields of work. The City is confident that other community leaders will step up to assist the Team in the months to come.

Current members of the Rundberg Revitalization Team and their areas of interest are:

Chair: Erica Saenz

Co-Chair: Roberto Perez

Parliamentarian: Cary Roberts

Place 1: City of Austin Neighborhood Planning Representative. The Team representative for Neighborhood Planning will provide guidance and direction on the City's planning process. This Team position is held by Margaret Valenti, Senior Planner for the City of Austin Planning & Development Review Department.

Place 2: Heritage Hills/Windsor Hills Neighborhood Planning Area Representative. This position is held by Linda Krueger.

Place 3: North Lamar/Georgian Acres Neighborhood Planning Area Representative. This position is held by Don Shepard.

Place 4: North Austin Civic Association Neighborhood Planning Area Representative. This position is held by Brian Almon.

The Team members for **Places 2, 3 and 4** will represent the interests of those living within their respective planning area boundaries. The planning areas were defined by the neighborhoods prior to Council adoption of the neighborhood plans.

Place 5: Education Representative (elementary, middle and high school levels). The Place 5 Education Representative will provide guidance and insight into elementary, middle, and high school level academic issues and related challenges within the entire revitalization area. This Team position is held by Ann Teich.

Place 6: Education Representative (higher education). The Place 6 Education Representative will provide knowledge, insight and guidance into higher education and trade-related issues and challenges within the entire revitalization area. This position is held by Erica Saenz.

Place 7: Hispanic Leadership Representative. The Hispanic Leadership Representative will provide guidance on culturally relevant topics and will represent the interests of the Rundberg Neighborhood's Hispanic community. This position is held by Roberto Martinez.

Place 8: Immigrant Community Representative. The Immigrant Community representative will provide guidance on culturally relevant topics and will represent the interests of the Rundberg Neighborhood's immigrant community. This position is held by Patricia Zavala.

Place 9: Faith-Based Community Representative. The Faith-Based Community Representative will provide assistance in networking within and representing the interests of the Rundberg Neighborhood's faith-based community. This position is held by Pastor Rick Randall.

Place 10: Affordable Housing/Homelessness Prevention Representative. The Affordable Housing/Homelessness Prevention Representative will provide guidance and insight into affordable housing and homelessness issues and challenges. This position is held by Michael Willard.

Place 11: Public Safety Representative. The Public Safety Representative will provide guidance and direction on public safety issues, concerns, partnerships, and initiatives. This position is held by Donald Baker, Region II Commander, City of Austin Police Department.

Place 12: Economic Development Representative. The Economic Development Representative will provide guidance and insight into private sector, business, and related challenges currently faced by the Rundberg Neighborhood. This position is held by Cary Roberts, Executive Director, Greater Austin Crime Commission.

Place 13: Community Health Representative. The Community Health Representative will provide guidance on and assistance with resolving health-related challenges within the Rundberg Neighborhood. This position is held by Mary Jo Hernandez.

Place 14: Hispanic Leadership Representative. The Hispanic Leadership Representative will provide guidance on culturally relevant topics and will represent the interests of the Rundberg Neighborhood's Hispanic community. This position is held by Roberto Perez.

Research, Assessment and Sustainability

Assess program implementation in collaboration with The University of Texas and other research partners, and plan for sustainment of effective strategies with private and public funding.

Strategy

In addition to the above described research efforts, we will use a quasi-experimental research design that compares changes in reported crime, calls for service, and disorder in the Rundberg neighborhood to other comparable high crime areas of the city and to the citywide trends. A Sustainability Planning Guide for Healthy Communities (2010 CDC guide).

Implementation Activities and Logistics

The City and University will utilize Sherman et al.'s (1998) evidence-based approach to guide program development and implementation. Using Sherman's refined Triple-T strategy of policing (2013), we will *target*, *test* and *track* the impact of our efforts.

Triple-T: Targeting, Testing, and Tracking.

1. Police should conduct and apply good research to *target* their scarce resources on predictable concentrations of harm from crime and disorder.
2. Once they choose their high-priority targets, police should review or conduct *tests* of police methods to help choose what works best to reduce harm.
3. Once police agencies use research to *target* their *tested* practices, they should generate and use internal evidence to *track* the daily delivery and effects of those practices, including the publicly-perceived legitimacy of policing. (Sherman, 2013, p. 5).

Dr. David Springer is the Principal Investigator for the research partner, The University of Texas at Austin. The University is responsible for assisting in all phases of project planning and strategic analysis. University staff acts as a resource for the Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team and attends Team meetings, providing research and evaluation activity updates, insights, and recommendations. The work of the University will be critical in developing new proposals to create complimentary projects and sustain successful activities.

Over the course of the implementation period, Dr. Springer will guide University efforts, which include:

- Research projects as assigned by the UT School of Social Work
- Continuation of data related activities
 - collect crime, census, observational, and qualitative data with ongoing analysis and re-analysis of impact, effectiveness and necessary refinement
 - research and recommend options for success in each area as crime is displaced or disrupted
 - explore ways to improve upon analysis and assessment tools
 - work with project partners to complete asset and resource management efforts

- examine the community's perceptions of crime, through dialogue, focus groups, correspondence, surveys and all other available means
- Conduct interviews with police personnel, city partners, community members and community agency representatives
- Perform direct observations of the crime hotspots
- Implement a survey of hot spot residents to assess collective (community) efficacy and general feelings of safety and well-being in the hot spots; and,
- Create a list and layered mapping to track known offenders, review reports and intelligence, and organize information
- Assist in modifying the refugee/immigrant education curriculum for use in the marketplace
- Assist the apartment/landlord coalitions with developing logistics and coordinating with the marketplace
- Assist in developing a job description and hiring the community engagement specialist and provide mentoring for the new hire
- Assist with leadership education for the Rundberg Revitalization Team and community members
- Assist with selecting juvenile justice programming options, resultant scope of work, and ongoing assessment/evaluation of selected activities

The research team meets weekly, typically by phone, and will continue to schedule in-person meetings as needed. Dr. Springer will continue to coordinate logistics for the University staff assigned to this project, which includes:

Michael Lauderdale, PhD
Professor of Social Work, Academic Interest in Policing and Youth Gangs

William Kelly, PhD
Professor of Sociology, Academic Interest in Criminology

Yessina Castro, PhD
Assistant Professor of Social Work, Academic Interest in Latino Health

Brian Davis, MS
Associate AD Academics for Football, Leadership and Community Development

Noel Landuyt, PhD
Research Scientist, Academic Interest in Organizational Development and Survey Research

Ahmed Whitt, PhD
Assistant Professor, Academic Interest in Impact of Neighborhood Factors on Adolescent Health

Luis Zayas, PhD
Social Work Dean, Academic Interest in Latino Health and Immigration

Student Assistants

Katie Casstevens

MSSW/MPA_{ff} dual degree student will assist Dr. Springer and the research team with all aspects of the project as a Graduate Research Assistant

Adriana Linares

MSSW student native Spanish Speaker from Houston with father from El Salvador

Megan Rose Morgan

MSSW student and trained in survey research

Vanessa Delgado

BSW student native Spanish Speaker from El Paso and trained in survey research

References

- Aber, J. L., Gephart, M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Connell, J., & Spencer, M. B. (1997). Neighborhood, family, and individual processes as they influence child and adolescent outcomes. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Vol. 1. Context and consequences for children* (pp. 44–61). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Anselin, L., Cohen, J., Cook, D., Gorr, W., & Tita, G. (2000). Spatial analysis of crime. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Criminal justice volume 4: Measurement and analysis of crime and justice* (pp. 213–262). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and crime rates*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Armour, M. P., & Umbreit, M. S. (2007). Victim-offender mediation and forensic practice. In D. W. Springer & A. R. Roberts (Eds.), *Handbook of forensic mental health with victims and offenders: Assessment, treatment, and research* (pp. 519-539). NY: Springer Publishing Co.
- Bazemore, G. (2001). Young people, trouble, and crime. Restorative justice as a normative theory of informal social control and social support. *Youth & Society*, 35(2), 199-226.
- Bazemore, G., & Schiff, M. (2005). *Juvenile justice reform and restorative justice: Building theory and policy from practice*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Bazemore, G., & Umbreit, M. S. (1999). Rethinking the sanctioning function in juvenile court: Retributive or restorative responses to youth crime. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41(3), 296-316.
- Bender, K. (2007). *Interrupting the cycle of violence: Identifying gender-specific pathways from childhood victimization to juvenile delinquency*. The University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work: Dissertation Manuscript.
- Bender, K. (2012). The mediating effect of school engagement in the relationship between youth maltreatment and juvenile delinquency. *Children and Schools*, 34(1), 37–48.
- Bennett, T. (1998). Crime prevention. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The handbook of crime and punishment* (pp. 369–402). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bjerregaard, B., & Smith, C. (1993). Gender differences in gang participation, delinquency, and substance use. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 9, 329–355.
- Bowen, L. K., Gwiasda, V., & Brown, M. M. (2004). Engaging community residents to prevent violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(3), 356-367.

Braga, A., Pierce, G., McDevitt, J., Bond, B., & Cronin, S. (2008). The strategic prevention of gun violence among gang-involved offenders. *Justice Quarterly*, 25, 132–162.

Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2012). *The effects of “pulling levers” focused deterrence strategies on crime*. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2012:6.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Butts, J. A., & Mears, D. P. (2011). Trends in American youth crime. In D. W. Springer & A. R. Roberts (Eds.), *Juvenile justice and delinquency* (pp. 23-52). Boston, MA: Jones & Bartlett.

Carmichael, D., Whitten, G., & Voloudakis, M. (2005). *Study of minority over-representation in the Texas juvenile justice system*. Submitted to the Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division. Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University.

Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C. B., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). The importance of bonding on school for health development: Findings from the Social Development Research Group. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 252–261.

Church, W., Springer, D. W., & Roberts, A. R. (Eds.). (in press). *Juvenile justice sourcebook* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cocozza, J. J., Skowrya, K. R., & Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention, W. D. C. (2000). Youth with mental health disorders: Issues and emerging responses. *Juvenile Justice*, 7(1), 3–13.

Crooks, C. V., Scott, K. L., Wolfe, D. A., Chiodo, D., & Killip, S. (2007). Understanding the link between childhood maltreatment and violent delinquency: What do schools have to add? *Child Maltreatment*, 12(3), 269–280.

De Coster, S., Heimer, K., & Wittrock, S. M. (2006). Neighborhood disadvantage, social capital, street context, and youth violence. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 47, 723–753.

Dunworth, T., Mills, G., Corder, G., & Greene, J. (1999). *National evaluation of Weed and Seed: Cross-site analysis*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Esbensen, F. A., & Huizinga, D. (1993). Gangs, drugs, and delinquency in a survey of urban youth. *Criminology*, 31, 565–589.

Esbensen, F. A., & Winfree, L. T. (1998). Race and gender differences between gang and nongang youths: Results from a multisite survey. *Justice Quarterly* 15, 505–526.

Esbensen, F. A., Peterson, D., Taylor, T. J., & Osgood, W. (2012). *Is G.R.E.A.T. effective? Does the program prevent gang joining? Results from the national evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.*

(Unpublished manuscript). Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Retrieved from [http://www.umsl.edu/ccj/pdfs/great/GREAT Wave 4 Outcome Report](http://www.umsl.edu/ccj/pdfs/great/GREAT%20Wave%204%20Outcome%20Report)

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Ormrod, R., Hamby, S., & Kracke, K. (2009, October). *Children's exposure to violence: A comprehensive national survey* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(2), 117–142.

Fite, P., Preddy, T., Vitulano, M., Elkins, S., Grassetti, S., & Wimsatt, A. (2012). Perceived best friend delinquency moderates the link between contextual risk factors and juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 40(6), 747–761.

Fraser, M. W., & Terzian, M. A. (2005). Risk and resilience in child development: Practice principles and strategies. In G. P. Mallon & P. McCartt Hess (Eds.) *Handbook of children, youth, and family services: Practice, policies, and programs* (pp. 55–71). New York: Columbia University Press.

Hartford, K., Carey, R., & Mendonca, J. (2006). Pre-arrest diversion of people with mental illness: Literature review and international survey. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 24(6), 845–856.

Hawkins, J. D., & Weis, J. G. (1985). The social development model: An integrated approach to delinquency prevention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 6, 73–97.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., & Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implication for substance use prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64–105.

Hawkins, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Farrington, D. P., Brewer, D. P., Catalano, R. F., Harachi, T. W., & Cothorn, L. (2000, April). *Predictors of youth violence* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Hawkins, J. D., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Abbott, R. D. (2005). Promoting positive adult functioning through social development intervention in childhood: Long-term effect from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, 159, 5–31.

Haynie, D., Silver, E., & Teasdale, B. (2006). Neighborhood characteristics, peer networks, and adolescent violence. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 22, 147–169.

Hipp, J., Tita, G., & Greenbaum, R. (2009). Drive-bys and trade-ups: examining the directionality of the crime and residential instability relationship. *Social Forces*, 87, 1778–1812.

Howell, J. C. (Ed.) (1995). *Guide to implementing the comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Ingoldsby, E. M., & Shaw, D. S. (2002). Neighborhood contextual factors and early-starting antisocial pathways. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 5(1), 21–55.

Jencks, C., & Mayer, S. (1990). The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighborhood. In L. E. Lynn & M. F. H. McGahey (Eds.), *Inner-city poverty in the United States* (pp. 111–186). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Jenson, J. M., & Fraser, M. W. (2006). A risk and resilience framework for child, youth, and family policy. In J. M. Jenson & M. W. Fraser (Eds.), *Social policy for children and families: A risk and resilience perspective* (pp. 1–18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jung, S. (2007). Understanding racial-ethnic disparities in internal school suspension and identifying compensatory and protective factors. *Dissertation Abstracts* (UMI No. AAT 3226969). The University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work.

Kirby, L., & Fraser, M. (1997). Risk and resilience in childhood. In M. W. Fraser (Ed.), *Risk and resilience in childhood: An ecological perspective* (pp. 10–33). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Klofas, J., Hipple, N., McDevitt, J., Bynum, T., McGarrell, J., & Decker, S. (2006). Crime incident reviews: A Project Safe Neighborhood strategic intervention. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Klofas, J., Hipple, N., & McGarrell, E. (2010). *The new criminal justice: American communities and the changing world of crime control*. New York: Routledge.

Lauderdale, Michael L. (2013). *Mexico – Path to a Failed State?* Austin, TX: Amazon.

Lee, S., Aos, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Miller, M., & Anderson, L. (2012). *Return on investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes, April 2012 update*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Lieberman, A. (2007). *Adolescents, neighborhoods and violence: Recent findings from the Project on Human Development in Chicago neighborhoods*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Justice.

Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Young children who commit crime: Epidemiology, developmental origins, risk factors, early interventions, and policy implications. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12(4), 737–762.

Maxson, C., & Whitlock, M. (2002). Joining the gang: gender differences in risk factors for gang membership. In C. Huff (Ed.), *Gangs in America* (3rd ed., pp. 19–35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- McCarter, S. A., Haber, M. G., & Kazemi, D. (2010). Models to guide system reform for at-risk youth. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 39*(6), 465–479.
- Mendez, L. R. (2003). Predictors of suspension and negative school outcomes: A longitudinal investigation. *New Directions for Youth Development, 99*, 17–33.
- Moore, J., & Hagedorn, J. (2001). *Female gangs: A focus on research*. Washington, DC, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Osher, F., Steadman, H. J., & Barr, H. (2003). A best practice approach to community reentry from jails for inmates with co-occurring disorders: The APIC model. *Crime & Delinquency, 49*(1), 79–96.
- Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Pullmann, M. D., Kerbs, J., Koroloff, N., Veach-White, E., Gaylor, R., & Sieler, D. (2006). Juvenile offenders with mental health needs: Reducing recidivism using wraparound. *Crime & Delinquency, 52*(3), 375–397.
- Ratcliffe, J. H., Taniguchi, T., Groff, E. R., & Wood, J. D. (2011). The Philadelphia foot patrol experiment: A randomized controlled trial of police patrol effectiveness in violent crime hot spots. *Criminology, 49*(3), 795-831.
- Rosenfeld, R., Bray, T., & Egley, A. (1999). Facilitating violence: A comparison of gang-motivated, gang-affiliated, and nongang youth homicides. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 15*, 495–516.
- Rosenfeld, R., Fornagno, R., & Baumer, E. (2005) Did Cease-fire, Compstat, and Exile reduce homicide? *Criminology and Public Policy, 44*, 419–449.
- Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(3), 603-651.
- Sherman, L. W. (2013). Targeting, testing and tracking police services: The rise of evidence-based policing, 1975-2025. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice in America, 1975-2025* (Vol. 42). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sherman, L., & Eck, J. (2002). Policing for crime prevention. In L. Sherman, D. Farrington, B. Welsh, & D. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Evidence-based crime prevention* (pp. 295–329). New York: Routledge.
- Sherman, L., Gartin, P., & Buerger, M. (1989). Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place. *Criminology, 27*, 27–56.

Snyder, H. N. (2012). *Patterns and trends: Arrests in the United States, 1990–2010*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs.

Springer, D. W., & Roberts, A. R. (2011). *Juvenile justice and delinquency*. Boston, MA: Jones & Bartlett.

Springer, D. W. and colleagues (2007). *Transforming juvenile justice in Texas: A framework for action. Blue ribbon task force report*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work.

Steele, P. (2005). *The Westside and Eastside Weed and Seed sites: Social attainment, demographic, and crime characteristics in thirteen contiguous neighborhoods in Albuquerque, New Mexico: Final report*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Community Capacity and Development Office.

Steele, P. (2006). *Community Critical Incident Reviews: Modeling a community-oriented policing approach in two Weed and Seed sites: Final report*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Community Capacity and Development Office.

Suter, J., & Bruns, E. (2009). Effectiveness of the wraparound process for children with emotional behavioral disorders: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 12, 336–351.

Tita, G., Cohen, J., & Engberg, J. (2005). An ecological study of the location of gang “set space.” *Social Problems*, 52, 272–299.

Craig D. Uchida, Marc L. Swatt, Shellie E. Solomon, Sean Varano (July 2013),
Data-Driven Crime Prevention: New Tools for Community Involvement and Crime Control.

Wasserman, G. A., Keenan, K., Tremblay, R. E., Coie, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Loeber, R., & Petechuk, D. (2003). *Risk and protective factors of child delinquency*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Weisburd, Groff, & Yang (2012). *The criminology of place: Street segments and our understanding of the crime problem*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J. H., Ayers, C. D., & Arthur, M. W. (1997). Risk and protective factors in the development of delinquency and conduct disorder. In M. W. Fraser (Ed.), *Risk and resilience in childhood: An ecological perspective* (pp. 140–170). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Wilson, A., & Draine, J. (2006). Collaborations between criminal justice and mental health systems for prisoner reentry. *Psychiatric Services (Washington, D.C.)*, 57(6), 875–878.

CITY OF AUSTIN
BYRNE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INNOVATION PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RESEARCH REPORT

Appendix A

Observations of Place – Hotspot Analysis

3 Observation Points:

Rundberg/I35, Powell/Sam Rayburn and Northgate/Rundberg

Directions:

For this undertaking, you are observing one of the above noted places. Please circle the place where the observations have been made. Please collect as much information as possible on the following items. Additional information is welcomed. Provide it following the observation protocol.

Rationale for Observations:

Observations of places provide us with useful data regarding behavior settings. Behavior settings are small scale social systems whose components include people and inanimate objects. Using the most recent research on hotspot analysis, a focus on the micro-level of places provides us with a chance to delve into the social disorganization of a place and the opportunity factors that contribute to crime.

PEOPLE-

Who do you see?

How many people are outside?

Can you see people inside? How many?

What is their ethnicity?

What is their age?

ACTIVITIES-

What is going on in the place?

How are people interacting?

Who is talking to whom?

What are people doing?

Where are they going?

How did they get here and how do they get out (access)?

PHYSICAL ASPECTS-

What do you see in terms of:

Lighting?

Litter/garbage?

Weeds/lawns?

Graffiti?

*Types of buildings? Businesses (what kind)? Housing (High/low density)? Public facilities (firehouse, police, parks, rec center)? Vacant buildings?

Foot paths?

Parking?

Transit stops?

Access in and out?

*In writing about buildings, describe them in detail (i.e. state of repair, toys out front, bikes out front, etc.).


CITY OF AUSTIN
BYRNE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INNOVATION PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RESEARCH REPORT

Appendix B

Grant Area **Hot Spot** Totals By Day, 2009-October 2013

GO_Occured_Date_Year (Multiple Items)


Count of Sday	Column Labels							Grand Total
Row Labels	SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	
Hotspot 1	21	14	13	13	11	14	17	103
Hotspot 2	6	5	5	3	1	3	8	31
Hotspot 3	30	16	15	23	10	15	27	136
Grand Total	57	35	33	39	22	32	52	270



Grant Area Totals By Day, 2009-October 2013


GO Occured Date Year (Multiple Items)

Count of Sday	Column Labels							Grand Total
Row Labels	SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	
E	282	201	161	163	159	182	245	1393
1	67	52	33	38	36	51	64	341
2	107	79	63	56	59	56	84	504
3	108	70	65	69	64	75	97	548
Grand Total	282	201	161	163	159	182	245	1393




Hot Spot #1 Totals By Day & Time, 2009-October 2013


Time Range	0 - 3	3 - 6	6 - 9	9 - 12	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 21	21 - 24	Grand Total
SUN	3	5	2	1		4	2	4	21
MON	2	1	2	2		3		4	14
TUE	1			1	1	5	4	1	13
WED	1	4	1	1	1		1	4	13
THU	2	2	2	1			2	2	11
FRI	2	2			1	1	1	7	14
SAT	6	1	1		1	1	3	4	17
Grand Total	17	15	8	6	4	14	13	26	103



Hot Spot #2 Totals By Day & Time, 2009-October 2013


Time Range	0 - 3	3 - 6	6 - 9	9 - 12	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 21	21 - 24	Grand Total
SUN	2	1		1		1	1		6
MON	2	2	1						5
TUE		1				1	1	2	5
WED	2				1				3
THU	1								1
FRI	1						1	1	3
SAT	3	1	1			1		2	8
Grand Total	11	5	2	1	1	3	3	5	31






Hot Spot #3 Totals By Day & Time, 2009-October 2013

Time Range	0 - 3	3 - 6	6 - 9	9 - 12	12 - 15	15 - 18	18 - 21	21 - 24
SUN	5	7	2		2	1	6	7
MON	6	3			1		1	5
TUE	5	1	1		1	4		3
WED	6	4		1		1	3	8
THU	2	2			1	1	1	3
FRI	2	3	1		1	1	1	6
SAT	9	4	5	1		2	2	4
Grand Total	35	24	9	2	6	10	14	36



Grand Total	
	30
	16
	15
	23
	10
	15
	27
	136



CITY OF AUSTIN
BYRNE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INNOVATION PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RESEARCH REPORT

Appendix C

**RESTORE RUNDBERG:
RECOMMENDED CRIME SOLUTIONS**

A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND
THE AUSTIN POLICE DEPARTMENT

BY

PROFESSOR DAVID KIRK, PH.D.
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

SEPTEMBER 22, 2013

SECTION I. BACKGROUND

In October 2012, the City of Austin received a \$1 million Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to revitalize the Rundberg community in north central Austin. The Rundberg community consists of three neighborhood planning areas, as adopted through the City of Austin’s neighborhood planning process: North Austin Civic Association, North Lamar Combined (North Lamar and Georgian Acres), and Heritage Hills/Windsor Hills.¹

The BCJI program is a core component of the White House’s Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (NRI), which aims to turn distressed neighborhoods into neighborhoods of opportunity. Other components of the NRI include the Department of Education’s Promise Neighborhoods program, the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Choice Neighborhoods program, and the newly created Promise Zones initiative, for which BCJI recipients are eligible to apply.² As outlined in the original grant solicitation, “the BCJI Program is designed to provide neighborhoods with coordinated federal support in the implementation of comprehensive place-based strategies to effectively reduce and prevent crime by connecting this support to broader comprehensive neighborhood revitalization efforts.”³ Accordingly, it is not the intent of the BCJI program to be the sole source of support to revitalize a selected neighborhood, nor is the intent to fund an isolated policing initiative that is separated from a “comprehensive” plan to revitalize a neighborhood. Rather, the intent is to partially fund a public safety component of a comprehensive revitalization effort. Ideally, there is tight integration and coordination between the BCJI public safety program and the larger revitalization effort.

Under the recognition that crime and other community problems are the result of numerous factors and cannot be prevented by any single tactic, the BCJI program requires a consortium of entities—criminal justice agencies, other government agencies, researchers, social service providers, community members and leaders, and other stakeholders—to collaborate to define the multiple interventions necessary to revitalize a community.⁴ Moreover, empirical evidence reveals that when the police partner with the community with sincere intention, good faith, and transparency, their crime control efforts are more likely to be accepted and are more effective (see Berrien and Winship 2002). The BCJI grant solicitation notes that this collaborative approach, “can have the biggest impact while also building the capacity of the community to deter future crime by addressing three of the social impacts most likely to impact crime: physical disorder; social economic status and resources; and the ‘collective efficacy’ of the neighborhood.”⁵ Collective efficacy is defined as cohesion and trust among members of a community and their willingness to intervene to control crime and maintain public order. One example of collective efficacy is the willingness of neighborhood residents to unite to advocate

¹ <http://austintexas.gov/page/neighborhood-planning-areas>

² <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/factsheet/building-ladders-of-opportunity>

³ https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=70

⁴ See Rosenbaum and Schuck (2012) for a discussion of the benefits of comprehensive community partnerships for preventing crime as well as the challenges to implementing them successfully. The research literature reveals that the most successful comprehensive collaborative partnerships to reduce crime demonstrate a commitment to evidence-based practices as well as crime prevention. Moreover, community involvement is essential to effective crime prevention strategies, in part by providing legitimacy for particular strategies.

⁵ See pp. 4-5 of the FY2012 Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Competitive Grant Announcement, available at: <https://www.bja.gov/Funding/12BCJIsol.pdf>.

for policy changes to ensure safer housing. Of import, the goal of the BCJI is not to provide a temporary reduction in crime, but to employ strategies that result in sustained reductions in crime by building community, reducing disorder, and strengthening collective efficacy.

Derivation of the concept “collective efficacy” as it relates to community conditions is commonly attributed to the work of Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) on the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN).⁶ Indeed, the scientific basis of the BCJI and the NRI are very much aligned with the major findings of the PHDCN (see Sampson 2012). The PHDCN is a long-term study of the relationship between neighborhood conditions, collective efficacy, and crime in Chicago neighborhoods, and is widely regarded as the most extensive social science study of neighborhood conditions, youth development, and crime produced to date. It is from this project that researchers established the critical role that collective efficacy among neighborhood residents can play in controlling crime. One of the major conclusions of the PHDCN is that to remedy social problems, we must have policy interventions aimed at the community-level, and not strictly rely upon interventions that target individuals. The aims of the BCJI and NRI strictly adhere to this call for a place-based focus on community problems.

University of Texas Involvement in Restore Rundberg

A requirement of the BCJI program is for grantees to collaborate with a research partner. Given the success of federal investment in researcher-practitioner partnerships such as the Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI) and Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), it is now a best practice in comprehensive crime reduction initiatives to pair law enforcement and other criminal justice entities with researchers who can provide practitioners with input on evidence-based and cost-beneficial solutions to crime problems.⁷

The role of the researcher during the planning phase of the BCJI grant is to validate identified community challenges, and to offer strategic solutions to the crime problem focused on addressing *root causes* of crime. In later phases of the grant, research partners may assist with implementation of program strategies and evaluate program components. Whereas the inclusion of a research partner was necessary for the Austin Police Department (APD) to secure grant funding, arguably what will distinguish the BCJI initiative in the Rundberg community from the myriad other crime reduction strategies APD has attempted in the area are two factors: (1) whether APD builds trust with the community through the collaboration, and (2) whether APD acts upon and implements the evidence-based strategies recommended by the University of Texas based on extensive analysis of the community and input from stakeholders.

In July 2011, prior to the release of the BCJI call for proposals, Dr. Ronnelle Paulsen, then Manager of APD’s Planning, Records, and Crime Analysis Unit, contacted Dr. David Kirk of the University of Texas Department of Sociology for the purpose of cultivating a broader base of potential research partners in order to be better positioned to apply for grants. Paulsen was aware

⁶ <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/PHDCN/>

⁷ See <http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/gun-violence/prevention/sacsi.htm> and <http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/gun-violence/prevention/project-safe-neighborhoods.htm>.

of Kirk's long-standing involvement on the PHDCN. Kirk is also a member of the National Institute of Justice's Neighborhoods and Crime Prevention Working Group, which consists of a group of leading academics and practitioners tasked with assessing the state of knowledge about the most promising approaches to community crime prevention.⁸

In April 2012, APD grant coordinator Kyran FitzGerald contacted Dr. Kirk about applying for the Department of Justice's Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) grant. Kirk assisted FitzGerald with the development of the grant proposal and agreed to serve as a research advisor to the project during the first year planning phase. Kirk's two primary deliverables for the planning phase are: (1) to recommend innovative solutions to the crime problem in the Rundberg area, and (2) to assist APD with incorporating said recommendations into a project implementation plan.

To assist with background research for the Restore Rundberg initiative, Kirk sought pro bono legal research expertise from the Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic at the University of Texas School of Law (2013). Professor Heather Way and her Clinic law students Stephanie Trinh and Melissa Wyatt conducted an extensive review of legal and policy tools available to remedy problem properties in the Rundberg community. The information provided by the Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic was invaluable for crafting the recommendations contained within this report. Related to this work on problem properties, Professors Way and Kirk, along with several other colleagues, have initiated a year-long workshop series through the University of Texas Opportunity Forum to address strategies to promote safe and healthy neighborhoods in Austin.⁹

In addition to the Department of Sociology and the Law School, the School of Social Work at the University of Texas, led by Professors David Springer and Michael Lauderdale as well as Ph.D. student Heather Cole, has taken a prominent research role on the Restore Rundberg project. Among other deliverables, the Social Work team led by Dr. Springer will be responsible for evaluating the strategies implemented during the course of the Restore Rundberg initiative. Together, the University of Texas research team brings expertise across a wide array of disciplines.

Purpose of this Report

Rather than a lengthy academic discussion of neighborhood crime prevention, the intent of this document is to provide a relatively brief analysis and summary of recommendations for how BCJI grant enforcement funds should be used to lower crime and disorder as well as build community capacity and collective efficacy in the Rundberg community. Following dissemination of these recommendations and the ensuing discussions, APD—with necessary input from the Rundberg Revitalization Team, community residents, the University of Texas, and other stakeholders—will develop an implementation plan for submission to the Department of Justice. It is in this implementation plan that the strategies recommended in this report can be translated in greater detail to specific tactics. APD has the final authority over which grant-

⁸ See <http://nij.gov/nij/topics/crime/neighborhoods/research-working-group/meeting-04-2011.htm>

⁹ <http://www.utexas.edu/law/centers/opportunity-forum/>

funded strategies and tactics will be employed to reduce crime in the Rundberg community as well as how grant funds allocated for social service expenditures will be distributed.

There are numerous ways that BCJI grant funds could be used to address the crime problem in the Rundberg area, including some strategies that do not necessarily involve building community capacity, collective efficacy, or trust between the police and community. An important distinction should be made between crime control and crime prevention. As the late criminologist Peter Lejins (1967: 2) once noted, “If societal action is motivated by an offense that has already taken place, we are dealing with control; if the offense is only anticipated, we are dealing with prevention.” In essence, crime prevention refers to efforts to prevent crime before the act has been committed, and crime control includes responses after the fact. Crime control responses are typically associated with arrest, prosecution, and sanctioning.

The recommendations below, in accordance with the objectives of the BCJI program, are aimed at community crime prevention. They adhere to the goals of the BCJI in building community capacity, lessening physical disorder, strengthening collective efficacy, and lowering crime. That is, the University recommends a tight connection to the deployment of grant resources and the goals of the BCJI program. As noted in the Background section, the BCJI has a strong scientific foundation. Adherence to the goals of the BCJI program is not simply a necessity of grant management and being accountable to the Federal Government, rather it is good science.

SECTION II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It is widely acknowledged in the criminological literature that crime is the result of the convergence of (1) motivated offenders and (2) suitable targets in the 3) absence of capable guardians (Cohen and Felson 1979). Similarly, one central challenge to the Rundberg community is the absence of social control created by the inattention of absentee or neglectful landlords (particularly at multi-family properties) and potentially motel managers. APD spends considerable resources responding to calls for service and reported crimes in the hot spots of the Rundberg community, yet it remains challenging to significantly reduce criminal activity in the hot spots without eliminating the underlying problems associated with problem properties and lax place managers. The reason is because drug dealers, prostitutes, and other criminal offenders proliferate given the vacuum of social control. Drug dealers seek out locations for criminal activity that provide access to potential customers and where the likelihood of detection is minimal. They often avoid the gaze of place managers (i.e., landlords, property owners, or motel management) who may only be concerned with cash flow from the properties.

The typical drug enforcement strategy in the United States focuses on *offenders*, with actions such as arrests, undercover buys, and use of confidential informants. When jailed, another drug dealer is likely to take the original dealer’s place at the same location; when not jailed, the dealer may continue dealing. An alternative with a sound evidence-base and which can be implemented without great expense is criminal nuisance abatement. Criminal nuisance strategies target the *place* of criminal activity and work with owners and managers to permanently alter the underlying conditions that are attractive to drug dealers and other nuisance criminals.

Generally defined, nuisance abatement is a process whereby a government agency or other entity sues the owner of a property that is the source of a nuisance in order to bring about an end to the nuisance. The purpose of the lawsuit is to prove that the property owner or manager allowed illegal activity at the nuisance site or failed to make reasonable attempts to stop the activity (Office of the Attorney General of Texas 2011). This strategy, which seeks long-term solutions to nuisance problems and not simply the temporary removal of a nuisance offender, uses civil remedies to address the underlying problems associated with absentee landlords and inadequate motel management (Mazerolle, Price, and Roehl 2000). In addition to better property management, crime may be reduced through the elimination of housing code violations, the eviction of problem tenants, and the application of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles at the property. As the Office of Attorney General of Texas (2011: 1) argues, “The nuisance laws can have a positive effect on locations that law enforcement agencies have spent many man-hours policing. In addition, law enforcement agencies may see large monetary savings by reducing the need to respond to these locations in the future.” Given budget constraints in the city, strategies like nuisance abatement that reduce the need to repeatedly respond to nuisance locations could free up resources for neighborhood patrol, community policing, and the myriad special events that come to Austin each year.

Of note, the University of Texas is not recommending that APD abandon existing enforcement strategies at nuisance locations. Indeed, the Attorney General of Texas (2011: 1-2) makes the same point: “Our goal at the OAG [Office of the Attorney General] is not to abandon other conventional methods of law enforcement at these nuisance sites, but to supplement these efforts by providing an additional tool to address illegal activity in Texas communities.” Similarly, because the intent of the BCJI grant program is to supplement existing law enforcement efforts with innovative evidence-based practices, it would appear that use of nuisance abatement strategies is a good fit to the BCJI program.

Per Chapter 125 of the Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code, a common nuisance suit can be brought against “a person who maintains a place to which persons *habitually* go for the following purposes and who knowingly tolerates the activity and furthermore fails to make reasonable attempts to abate the activity”: discharge of a firearm in a public place; reckless discharge of a firearm; engaging in organized criminal activity as a member of a combination; delivery, possession, manufacture or use of controlled substances; gambling, gambling promotion, or communicating gambling information; prostitution, promotion of prostitution, or aggravated promotion of prostitution; compelling prostitution; commercial manufacture, commercial distribution, or commercial exhibition of obscene material; aggravated assault; sexual assault; aggravated sexual assault; robbery; aggravated robbery; unlawfully carrying a weapon; murder; capital murder; continuous sexual abuse of a young child or children; massage therapy or other massage services in violation of Chapter 455, Occupations Code; employing a minor at a sexually oriented business; trafficking of persons; sexual conduct or performance by a child; and employment harmful to a child.¹⁰ The statute applies to habitual activity at many types of properties, including single-family homes, multi-family properties, hotels, motels, and commercial establishments (Office of the Attorney General of Texas 2011). Once a property is ruled to be a common nuisance, it can be closed for a year.

¹⁰ <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/CP/htm/CP.125.htm>; See also Section 101.70 of the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Code: http://www.tabc.state.tx.us/laws/code_and_rules.asp

To justify a focus on nuisance abatement, it is first relevant to determine how many locations in Austin, or the Restore Rundberg project area specifically, fit the criteria described above. A challenge to making this determination is defining the word “habitual.” The standard used by APD is to define “habitual” as having three reported abatable offenses at the same location within a 12-month period. As of this writing, APD does not automatically flag cases that meet this criterion. Given that the creation of such an automated flag is a low-cost technological solution, the University of Texas research team recommends that APD updates its data systems to include such an automatic notification system.

In the absence of an automated report of all eligible nuisance abatement cases in Austin, the University of Texas research team analyzed how many residential addresses or motels in the Restore Rundberg project area (i.e., the three neighborhood planning areas mentioned above) had at least three abatable offenses *reported to APD* in a 12-month period of time.¹¹ Reported below are the number of locations that had at least three reported abatable offenses in any 12-month period between 2008 and 2012.¹²

Overall, 166 different locations in the Restore Rundberg project area had at least three reported nuisance crimes (i.e., specifically those crimes listed on the previous page) within any 12-month window from 2008 to 2012. In this case, locations are specific physical addresses, not intersections or blocks, which were then matched to property parcels in the Travis Central Appraisal District (TCAD) property records. Table 1 on the next page reveals the breakdown of locations in terms of property type, as listed in the TCAD records. Residential and motel/hotel property parcels accounted for 112 of the 166 properties. The most common non-residential location for the concentration of nuisance crimes in the Restore Rundberg area is a convenience store.

The 112 residential nuisance locations generated a total of 28,010 dispatched calls for service in 2011 and 2012, and this total *excludes* calls for service related to traffic and roadway issues (e.g., crashes, DUIs, stalled vehicles). At an estimated cost of \$142 per dispatched call for service, APD devoted just under \$4 million in resources to these 112 nuisance locations over this two-year period.¹³

¹¹ It is highly likely that there are many more abatable crimes occurring at nuisance locations that are not reported to APD, and this underreporting of crime may partly be a function of perceptions by nearby residents that APD is unable or unwilling to eliminate the crime problem at a respective nuisance location. Indeed, a convincing body of research evidence reveals that cynicism of the police and the legal system undermines individuals’ willingness to report crimes and cooperate with the police more generally (see Tyler and Fagan 2008).

¹² These numbers do not include “attempted” crimes as designated by APD (e.g., attempted prostitution). Moreover, as APD only supplied the University of Texas data on the “highest offense” for each criminal incident, it is very likely that the number of sites with habitual nuisance activity is conservative.

¹³ The \$142 per call for service estimate is derived from the following calculation. The FY2011-12 budget for APD totaled \$282,997,317. Page 111 of the budget notes that 57% of the budget, or approximately \$161.31M, is spent on “neighborhood-based policing” (City of Austin 2011). The 2012 Police Executive Research Forum (PERF; 2012: 28) report requested by the Austin City Council indicates that 57.2% of patrol time is spent on responding to calls for service (\$161.31M * .572 = \$92.27M). Page 20 of the same PERF report indicated that APD dispatched officers to 650,603 calls for service in 2011. That equates to \$141.82 per call for service (\$92.27M/605,603).

Table 1
Property Type of Criminal Nuisance Location

Residential or Motel/Hotel	Number
Single-Family Dwelling	6
Multi-Family Dwelling	90
Mobile Home Park	2
Motel/Hotel	14
Commercial, Retail, Industrial	54
Total	166

Similar to calls for service, the 112 residential nuisance locations are the sites for an enormous number of arrests and reported crimes. In 2012 alone, APD made 780 separate arrests at the residential nuisance locations. Between 2008 and 2012, 28,268 reported crimes occurred at these locations. Of this number, 6,686 were UCR Part I offenses, 17,437 were Part II offenses, and the remaining 4,145 were neither Part I nor Part II offenses. Table 2 presents the breakdown of Part I offenses by crime type at the 112 residential nuisance locations.

Table 2
Part I Index Crimes Reported at Residential Nuisance Locations

Index Crime Type	Number of Crimes, 2008-2012	Cost-per-Crime Estimate	Total Cost-of-Crime at Nuisance Locations
Murder	7	\$ 9,773,614	\$ 68,415,299
Rape	80	\$ 246,189	\$ 19,695,086
Robbery	407	\$ 76,023	\$ 30,941,365
Aggravated Assault	623	\$ 98,579	\$ 61,414,680
Burglary	3,431	\$ 14,798	\$ 50,773,585
Theft	1,473	\$ 2,417	\$ 3,560,344
Auto Theft	648	\$ 10,259	\$ 6,648,007
Arson	17	\$ 67,800	\$ 1,152,600
Total	6,686		\$ 242,600,966

Note: Cost-per-crime estimates derived from analysis reported by the RAND Corporation (Heaton 2010). The RAND estimates were adjusted for inflation, so the estimates in this table represent 2013 dollars. The RAND cost estimates include both tangible (e.g., property loss, medical costs, criminal justice expenditures) and intangible (e.g., psychological effects of victimization) costs of crime.

Table 2 also presents estimates of the costs of crime to victims and society. Costs of crime can be generally categorized by tangible and intangible costs (see Heaton 2010). Tangible costs include property loss, medical costs, lost productivity for victims, and expenditures associated with the arrest, prosecution, and sanctioning of offenders. Intangible costs are arguably harder to quantify, and include the psychological effects of victimization and lost quality of life from fear of crime. For some crimes, such as sexual assault, the tangible costs of crime are likely to be small relative to the intangible costs. Hence, failing to account for the intangible costs of crime likely results in an underestimation of the consequences of crime for victims and society.

Per the distinction between tangible and intangible costs, there are two general approaches for estimating the cost of crime: Accounting-based methods that sum the tangible costs that an individual and society bear (e.g., property loss, medical expenditures for injuries, expenses for the police, courts, and sanctioning) and contingent valuation methods in which individuals are asked, through hypothetical survey questions, the extent of their willingness to pay for crime reduction strategies. Contingent valuation methods capture both tangible and intangible costs.

The per-crime estimates reported in the last column of Table 2 are derived from a RAND Corporation review and analysis of the existing cost-of-crime studies (Heaton 2010). RAND developed an average cost per UCR index crime from the most rigorous studies of crime costs. Results reveal the crimes occurring at the 112 nuisance locations in the Restore Rundberg project area yielded an estimated cost to victims and society of \$242.6 million. Because most crimes are not reported to the police, this number of crimes and their associated cost reported in Table 2 do not even represent the true volume of criminal activity at these locations or the true cost to society.¹⁴ Nevertheless, given the extreme cost to victims and society of criminal activity at Rundberg area nuisance locations, arguably there is justification for using BCJI grant dollars on little used practices, such as nuisance abatement, for addressing the concentration of crime at nuisance locations.

Table 3 on the next page focuses specifically on the 13 motel and hotel nuisance locations in the Restore Rundberg area. With the exception of one hotel, InTown Suites on North Lamar, all of the motel/hotel nuisance sites are located on or within a block of Interstate 35. Table 3 reveals a number of interesting patterns. In three motels/hotels, crime totals declined significantly from 2008 to 2012, in four motels/hotels the trend was essentially flat, and in six motels/hotels the trend reveals a substantial increase in the volume of crime. In comparison, over this period the number of violent crimes declined 13% in Austin, and property crimes declined by 3%. This table validates a finding widely acknowledged among criminologists, that the sizable crime decline taking place throughout the United States over the past two decades has actually been located in relatively few neighborhoods (see, e.g., Weisburd et al. 2004). Most neighborhoods have stable patterns of crime, with some increasing. The motel/hotel sites in the Restore Rundberg area appear to bear this out.

¹⁴ The Bureau of Justice Statistics (Truman and Planty 2012) estimates, based on analysis of National Crime Victimization Survey data, that 49% of violent crimes and 37% of property crimes are reported to the police.

Table 3
Motel and Hotel Nuisance Locations

Name	Address	Calls for Service,		Reported Crime					Pct. Change 2008-12	AISD Students Residing at Property
		2011-2012	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012			
Days Inn	820 E. Anderson Lane WB	96	40	15	28	20	14	-65%	0	
Budget Lodge	9220 N. IH 35 SB	320	126	30	46	65	56	-56%	7	
InTown Suites	9909 N. Lamar	160	46	40	37	39	34	-26%	21	
Orangewood Inn and Suites	9121 N. IH 35 NB	196	44	29	52	38	43	-2%	1 to 4	
Super 8	8128 N. IH 35 SB	259	49	41	39	36	48	-2%	0	
Motel 6	8010 N. IH 35 SB	280	54	53	60	68	53	-2%	0	
Budget Inn	9106 N. IH 35 SB	287	58	63	64	41	58	0%	1 to 4	
Extended Stay America	8221 N. IH 35 NB	217	51	51	50	54	60	18%	1 to 4	
Austin Suites	8300 N. IH 35 SB	1,019	165	184	200	129	246	49%	10	
Red Roof Inn	8210 N. IH 35 SB	250	32	26	16	22	57	78%	0	
Motel 6	9420 N. IH 35 SB	582	61	55	74	83	111	82%	1 to 4	
Howard Johnson	7800 N. IH 35 SB	480	27	31	41	109	96	256%	1 to 4	
Economy Inn	700 Middle Lane	45	2	10	5	10	16	700%	0	
Total Violent Index Crimes				3,935	4,024	3,790	3,470	3,412	-13%	
Total Property Index Crimes				44,801	48,026	45,826	42,250	43,496	-3%	

Note: the 2008-2011 Total Violent and Property Index Crimes are reported in the APD Annual Crime and Traffic reports. The 2012 data on Index crimes was derived from the December 2012 APD Chief's Monthly Report (<http://austintexas.gov/page/chiefs-monthly-reports>). To protect the privacy of students living at motels and hotels, if a site houses very few AISD students (between 1 and 4), AISD just provided the range of the number of students residing at the site, not the precise number.

Interestingly, one of the very few motels/hotels with a substantial drop in crime over the five-year period is the Budget Lodge, located near the southwest corner of Rundberg Lane and Interstate 35 Southbound. Arguably the decline is the result of nuisance abatement proceedings. In 2008, the City of Austin filed a nuisance abatement lawsuit in federal court against the owner of Budget Lodge, Larry M. Hall (Harmon 2013). The case was settled in July 2009, with Mr. Hall agreeing to implement a variety of crime prevention measures and strategies at the property. More crime prevention work is still necessary, but the data reveal the efficacy of the nuisance abatement process for lowering crime. In the case of Budget Lodge, crime declined by over 50%.

To illustrate the grave consequences of habitual criminal activity at motel sites, it is worthwhile to examine the extent to which children are residing in proximity to the criminal activity. The final column of Table 3 provides an indication of the number of children residing at the respective motels who are currently enrolled in an AISD school. To protect the privacy of students living at motels and hotels, if a site houses very few AISD students (between 1 and 4), AISD provided the range of the number of students residing at the site. These data reveal that between 43 and 58 AISD students are living at the 13 motel and hotel nuisance sites. Hence, the sites are not simply locations where criminal activity proliferates. These are locations where children are being raised.

SECTION IV. CURRENT USE OF NUISANCE ABATEMENT IN APD¹⁵

APD and the City of Austin dedicate very limited resources to criminal nuisance abatement in comparison to practices in peer cities and relative to the number of eligible cases described in the previous section. For the last several years, APD had only one detective assigned to its Nuisance Abatement Unit, with another detective added to the Unit in the Spring of 2013 (University of Texas School of Law 2013). In comparison, there are roughly 2,300 sworn law enforcement and support personnel who work for APD. The Nuisance Abatement Unit used to be staffed with more officers, but towards the end of the last decade many of the officers in the Nuisance Unit either retired or were transferred to the Burglary Unit.

The two current detectives split their time with APD's Alcohol Control Team. The two detectives in the Nuisance Abatement Unit are responsible for nuisance cases citywide, and are challenged to manage a caseload of approximately 60 citywide cases. In contrast, the data reported on the preceding pages reveal that there are well more than 60 criminal nuisance sites in the Rundberg area alone.

As noted, nuisance abatement cases are not automatically flagged for attention by APD. Rather, the Nuisance Abatement Unit opens its cases based on referrals and complaints from other APD officers, typically from narcotics or the district representatives, as well as from Code Compliance and community residents. After some background investigation and a determination of whether a referred case meets the definition of a nuisance, the Nuisance Abatement Unit sends a certified accord letter to the property owner and attempts to set up a meeting to outline what steps the property owner must take to abate the criminal nuisance. If the property owner does not abate the

¹⁵ See the recent report by the University of Texas Law School (2013), "Addressing Problem Properties: Legal and Policy Tools for a Safer Rundberg and a Safe Austin," for further details about APD's nuisance abatement practices.

nuisance within a sufficient time and the criminal activity persists, APD can send the case to the City Attorney's office. In practice, APD has been sending only the most severe cases to the City Attorney's office. As described in detail in the recent report by the University of Texas School of Law (2013), nuisance abatement has been a neglected strategy in Austin because of a lack of investment of resources not only from APD, but also from the City Attorney's Office. As of June 2013, the City Attorney's office had four open criminal nuisance abatement cases and had not yet filed a lawsuit against the property owners in those cases. The University of Texas School of Law (2013) also reports that there is a lack of communication between the City Attorney and APD about nuisance cases, in that the City Attorney typically does not communicate with APD for many months about the status of cases. In one case, APD did not hear back from the City Attorney's Office for 18 months about the status of a case, and the investigation had to be reopened because of the delay.

Despite few resources dedicated to nuisance abatement in Austin, data on reported crimes and calls for service at locations associated with nuisance abatement cases reveals a sharp decline in activity following the opening of the case. A review of APD's nuisance abatement cases from 2011 reveals that in those cases in which the Nuisance Abatement Unit simply sent an accord letter to the property owner and had a follow-up meeting, reported crime declined 16%, on average, from the year before to the year after the case was opened.¹⁶ Recall that most cases never result in the filing of a lawsuit. Rather, this 16% decline in reported crime was the result of the actions of a lone detective, thereby providing justification that criminal nuisance abatement is a cost-effective method to reduce crime.

It is important to reiterate that in most instances filing a lawsuit will be unnecessary; the threat of legal action is often enough to bring property owners into compliance (Office of the Attorney General 2011). For instance, the lost revenue from the closure of a property following a successful nuisance suit can be a significant deterrent. In many instances, a certified letter followed by a meeting with an APD detective is all the action that is necessary to reduce the number of reported crimes and calls for service at nuisance locations. As described in the next section, the apparent success of nuisance abatement in Austin has been mirrored in numerous locations nationwide.

What is remarkable about the decline in crime and calls for service at the sites of the nuisance cases from 2011 is that there would seem to be very little potential for a deterrent effect because the City Attorney's Office does not typically pursue a lawsuit against a nuisance location, property owner, or manager even if APD opts to send the case to the City Attorney. If there was a credible threat of legal action, conveyed by having a City Attorney co-sign the accord letter and perhaps by having the attorney attend the accord meetings, then presumably compliance and the decline in crime and calls for service would be of a magnitude greater. As highlighted in the next section, the crime reduction benefits stemming from attention to criminal nuisance abatement can be even greater than already seen in Austin if nuisance abatement efforts are tightly coordinated with code enforcement officials, fire marshals, and city attorneys.

¹⁶ APD Detective Julie Long indicated in April 2013 that APD was updating their system to track the outcome of nuisance cases. These data are not yet available. The analysis reported above is based on the University's analysis of the volume of reported crimes and calls for service at addresses where nuisance cases were initiated in 2011.

SECTION IV. EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES AND BEST PRACTICES

The Office of Justice Programs within the U.S. Department of Justice recognizes the two programs described immediately to follow as evidence-based programs for reducing crime. Several years ago the Office of Justice Programs developed the CrimeSolutions.gov website (<http://www.crimesolutions.gov>) “to be a reliable and accessible resource to help practitioners and policy makers understand what works in justice-related programs and practices. It is intended to assist in decision making and inform the implementation of evidence-based programs or practices.”¹⁷ Those programs deemed to be “Effective” demonstrate strong evidence that they achieved the desired result or outcome. Oakland’s Beat Health Program¹⁸ and San Diego’s Drug Abatement Response Team¹⁹ are two nuisance abatement programs deemed effective at reducing crime and nuisance conditions. The Oakland Beat Health Program has also been deemed a “model program” of crime prevention by the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.²⁰

Oakland Beat Health Program

Oakland’s Beat Health Program targets high crime properties by using civil remedies to prevent and reduce criminal problems and incivilities (Mazerolle, Price, and Roehl 2000). Civil remedies generally aim to persuade or compel nonoffending third parties (i.e., property owners and managers) to take responsibility and action to prevent criminal behavior. The Beat Health Program, as originally implemented, had five teams to coincide with the five police beats in the city. Police on the Beat Health Team responded to sites that generated numerous calls for service or arrests, and the Team opened a case against the site or landlord/owner after conducting a preliminary visit to the nuisance site. In some instances, police also conducted a preliminary visit based on citizen complaints, thereby giving the community an active role in policing the neighborhood.

A key component of the program was coordination with a group of city inspectors called the Specialized Multi-Agency Response Team, which included representatives from code enforcement, fire, and public works. The vast majority of sites inspected through the Beat Health Program had at least one code violation (Mazerolle, Price, and Roehl 2000), thereby confirming that code and criminal violations tend to occur at the same locations, in part because of the neglect by property owners and managers.

Beat Health teams worked to establish positive relationships with landlords, managers, and owners. As part of the intervention, police communicated landlords’ rights and tenants’ responsibilities, and provided recommendations for crime prevention measures. On average,

¹⁷ <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/about.aspx>

¹⁸ <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=105>; see also <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/Matrix/GreenMazerolleetal00.html>;

¹⁹ <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=88>; see also <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/Matrix/EckWartell98.html>;

²⁰ <http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/Oakland%20Beat%20Health%20Program-MPGProgramDetail-454.aspx>

cases opened through the Beat Health Program were resolved in five months. Only 2% of cases resulted in formal court action against a property owner.

In terms of evaluation, Mazerolle, Price, and Roehl (2000) used a block randomized experimental design, a highly rigorous evaluation design, to assess the effectiveness of the Beat Health Program. With this design, 50 street blocks were randomly assigned to the Beat Health Program (the experimental sites) and 50 control sites received traditional law enforcement tactics. Both commercial and residential nuisance sites were included in the Program, and most of the sites were rental properties. The evaluation revealed that the 50 experimental sites had decreases in signs of disorder as well as decreases in drug trafficking. The evaluation reported that the number of drug calls decreased an average of 7% at each experiment site, yet increased 54.7% at control sites over the same time period.

As part of the evaluation, researchers also assessed whether criminal activity was simply displaced from the experimental sites to other nearby locations. Rather than displacement, evaluation results revealed that there was a diffusion of benefits to other nearby locations (defined as locations within a 500-foot radius). Calls for service associated with drug crimes did not merely decline at the specific nuisance site, but also in other nearby locations.

San Diego's Drug Abatement Response Team (DART)

The objective of the DART program was to reduce drug dealing at residential rental properties by compelling landlords to improve property management practices at drug nuisance sites. Targeted sites were those which had already been subject to traditional drug enforcement strategies by the San Diego Police Department's Narcotics Section, particularly drug raids.

To test the efficacy of nuisance abatement strategies, 121 nuisance sites were randomly assigned to different interventions: (1) a group in which property owners and managers received a letter informing them of the drug activity occurring at their property and the possibility of a lawsuit, followed by a meeting between the property owner, police, and code enforcement to develop a plan to mitigate the nuisance conditions; (2) a group which received the aforementioned letter, but not the meeting to discuss a resolution; and (3) a control group that received neither the letter nor meeting.

Eck and Wartell (1998) found that properties in the first group that received the letter with the threat of a lawsuit followed by a meeting with police and code enforcement experienced a significant reduction in crime relative to the other two groups. In fact, following the intervention, crime was 60% lower at those sites where owners received both the letter and meeting relative to the control group. Hence, the nuisance abatement process is more effective when the police and code enforcement meet with property owners to develop remedies for the nuisance conditions than if the police simply send a letter with information about a potential lawsuit.

Austin's Support Abatement Forfeiture Enforcement (SAFE) Team

Austin has its own history of successful collaborative efforts between police, code enforcement, the fire department, and city attorneys to remedy criminal nuisance problems. Between 1994 and

July of 1997, these city departments formed a group called the Support Abatement Forfeiture Enforcement team. During this time, the team of five or six individuals used the nuisance abatement process to target 500 problem properties in Austin, and filed lawsuits against 30 of the property owners (Greenberg 1997). The University of Texas research team contacted and interviewed former members of the SAFE team, all of whom expressed enthusiasm about the efficacy of such a strategy for crime prevention and the preservation of housing. However, it is not completely clear from these discussions why the SAFE team was disbanded and why APD turned attention to other law enforcement strategies despite the rich evidence base revealing the effectiveness of multi-agency teams to reduce nuisance crimes.

SECTION V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The University of Texas recommends that the Austin Police Department create the Rundberg Nuisance Abatement Program. This initiative would draw upon criminal and civil remedies to reduce drug crimes, prostitution, and other nuisance crimes in the Rundberg community. Modeled after evidence-based nuisance abatement programs in other cities, including Oakland's Beat Health Program and San Diego's Drug Abatement Response Team, the Rundberg Nuisance Abatement Program would aim to work with and to compel, if necessary, property owners, landlords, and motel/hotel owners and managers to take responsibility to prevent criminal and nuisance behavior on the premises of their properties.

To better understand and define the nature of the problem—that is, the concentration of drug activity and associated crime and disorder at particular locations—the University recommends that the Rundberg Nuisance Abatement Program be led by a task force convened on a regular basis. This task force will consist of, at a minimum, stakeholders from the Austin Police Department, Austin Code Compliance, the City of Austin Attorney's Office, the Austin Fire Department, and community representatives. Other possible task force members include members of the Austin Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department, the Travis County District Attorney's Office, non-profit community developers, and stakeholders from the Rundberg Revitalization Team. The charge of the task force will be to identify and deploy tools to remedy problem properties in the Rundberg area, with a focus on residential property (especially multi-family rentals) as well as budget motels. Properties may include those that are vacant, blighted, and neglected, as well as properties that are the site of habitual criminal activity.

To help the Austin Police Department and other City agencies evaluate the cost effectiveness and cost-benefit of the Rundberg Nuisance Abatement Program, the University suggests that the Nuisance Abatement Task Force implement nuisance abatement tasks via a rigorous research design that will allow the task force to determine the level of crime reduction benefits at implementation sites relative to control sites, as well as the diffusion effects (or displacement) into adjacent areas. Specifically, the University recommends employing a block randomized demonstration project that assigns both residential and motel properties with habitual drug and nuisance activity to control and experimental groups. Commercial motels will be assigned to one

block and residential addresses to a second block, with treatment and control locations randomized from within the blocks.²¹

Properties in the control group would receive traditional police tactics from uniformed patrol officers (e.g., responses to calls for service, arrests). Properties in the experimental groups would receive an assortment of civil remedies, starting with a certified letter from the Austin Police Department to property owners and motel managers describing the nature of problem conditions at their location—including criminal activity, but also code violations and noncompliance with municipal regulations—and the possible legal actions the City of Austin may pursue should the owner or manager not cooperate to eliminate the nuisance conditions on the premises. Property owners as well as motel managers and employees should be offered assistance from the Task Force to, for example, train them in management practices designed to recognize and eliminate drug dealing and associated crimes such as prostitution. Police Detectives, Code Compliance Inspectors, and Fire Marshalls may also inspect the property, and offer steps the owner needs to take to make the property a less attractive target for offenders and to eliminate any code violations. For property owners who fail to take reasonable steps to stop the nuisance and criminal activity taking place on their property, the Austin Police Department should work with the City Attorney’s Office—or the Travis County District Attorney’s Office—to bring court action against the property, property owner, manager, and/or resident.²² The court may then order that the owner take specific steps to remedy the nuisance activity, and may also order that the property be closed for one year (University of Texas School of Law 2010). For multi-family properties, a receiver could be appointed by the court to manage the property.

The creation of the Nuisance Abatement Task Force is a key component of the nuisance abatement program, and will be used to sustain nuisance abatement efforts after the completion of the grant period. Simply, the purpose of the grant is to not only test the efficacy of crime prevention strategies in Rundberg, but to institutionalize the collaborative effort should the initiative be deemed successful. One reason why civil remedies have not received sufficient attention in Austin for addressing the underlying reasons for crime is because a variety of barriers exist in the city and surrounding county to institutionalizing such relationships. Yet a collaborative effort between police, code and fire inspectors, prosecutors, and other stakeholders allows for the coordination of a variety of potential enforcement actions against a given property. For instance, if police and code inspectors coordinate enforcement with non-profit community developers who may be interested in investment in a given area, then short- to mid-term reductions in crime can lead to long-term reductions because of redevelopment. Yet community developers may be reluctant to invest in a neighborhood without focused enforcement resources to clean up the neighborhood. Thus, the potential benefits of this project are: (1) the reduction of crime and disorder at nuisance sites, and (2) the institutionalization of collaborative working relationships and data sharing between the Austin Police Department, Code Compliance, the Austin Fire Department, the City Attorney’s Office, and other stakeholder agencies and groups.

To underscore a point made previously, nuisance abatement is most effective when the threat of a potential lawsuit is credible. To make that threat credible, APD needs to gain the participation

²¹ Using a randomized block designs ensures that dissimilar cases are not compared to each other (e.g., comparing a motel to a residence).

²² Chapter 125, Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

of the City Attorney's Office. If a City Attorney works with APD on a nuisance case from the outset, the attorney can provide APD insight about the best ways to investigate the nuisance and the type of evidence that is necessary to pursue a lawsuit. Moreover, the deterrent threat of a certified accord letter may be enhanced if both APD and a city prosecutor sign-on, and a prosecutor is willing to pursue a nuisance case in court and is experienced enough to do so.

A barrier to gaining prosecutorial help with nuisance abatement is the fact that many assistant city attorneys are recent law graduates without requisite experience in housing law or experience in criminal court. For these reasons, the University recommends that the City of Austin use a portion of the \$454,628 designated in the original grant proposal budget for law enforcement *to hire an attorney with expertise in housing law and nuisance abatement, as well as experience in criminal court, for the two-year duration of the BCJI grant*. The University recommends that the remaining grant funds be distributed between APD, the Austin Fire Department, and Code Compliance to cover costs associated with implementing the Rundberg Nuisance Abatement Program.²³

SECTION VI. CAVEATS AND CONCLUSION

In developing the Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program as a key component of the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative, the Federal Government recognized that “public safety is a prerequisite for the regeneration of communities and the revitalization of civic engagement in those communities.”²⁴ Addressing the same point, the Office of Texas Attorney General Greg Abbott (2011: 1) explains: “By denying [through nuisance abatement] criminal offenders the use of real property as a base of operations, and by securing the property owner’s cooperation in the removal of criminal offenders, neighborhood revitalization can become a reality.” In this way, attention to nuisance abatement, and problem property conditions more generally, can provide a foundation for other neighborhood revitalization activities.

Implementing a successful nuisance abatement strategy is not without challenges. It requires both capacity and willingness. On the former, effective collaboration among enforcement agencies, including police, fire, code enforcement, city attorneys, and even county and district attorneys, is required. Ensuring collaboration may require an initial investment of resources to participating agencies, and that is precisely where BCJI grant resources can be used—i.e., to invest in evidence-based solutions to public safety that can provide a foundation for neighborhood revitalization. In terms of willingness, enforcement agencies must not only be willing to work together, but must also be willing to implement a nuisance abatement strategy. Nuisance abatement is not a new strategy. Rather, despite a solid foundation of research

²³ Whereas APD’s initial budget to the Federal Government did not allocate funds for Code Compliance, the Fire Department, or the City Attorney, the BCJI program allows for and expects revisions to be made to the budget to coincide with the implementation plan submitted for approval at the end of the year one planning phase (see <https://www.bja.gov/Funding/12BCJIsol.pdf>). APD recognized on page 8 of its grant proposal to the Federal Government the likelihood of revising the budget: “The budget proposed with this application is the City’s best estimate of costs and will likely require significant revisions once the implementation plan is complete.”

²⁴ See page 4 of the FY2012 Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Competitive Grant Announcement, available at: <https://www.bja.gov/Funding/12BCJIsol.pdf>.

evidence, it has not been a priority in Austin. A successful implementation of a nuisance abatement strategy requires the removal of organizational resistance to such a strategy.

As part of the Rundberg Nuisance Abatement Program, the University of Texas proposes to conduct an evaluation of the process, outcome, and cost-benefits (relative to other policing strategies) of coordinated and collaborative attention to criminal nuisance abatement. A randomized project implementation is critical for producing conclusive evidence. If a rigorous evaluation reveals, as prior research strongly suggests, that a comprehensive nuisance abatement strategy is a cost-effective and cost-beneficial way to reduce crime in Austin, then the next step is to determine a way to fund the strategy permanently, by adding resources to the respective departmental budgets *or* reallocating resources away from less cost-beneficial strategies. It is all too common with grant programs that once the funding runs out, agencies revert to traditional practices even if, in this case, traditional methods to control crime are not as cost-beneficial as the methods introduced through a grant initiative.

A key assumption underlying the recommendations in this report is that BCJI grant dollars designated for “enforcement”—i.e., funds except those allocated for research, evaluation, or social services—would only be allocated to city agencies tasked with the enforcement of city and state laws and ordinances. Put simply, the assumption is that any recommendations about the use of grant funds must be focused on activities of city agencies, mainly the Austin Police Department and possibly Code Compliance, the Fire Department, and the Law Department. The crime enforcement activities of the police and other city departments may not be the most cost-beneficial strategy for lowering crime. Thus, if the City of Austin and the Austin Police Department are willing to allocate BCJI grant funds to prevention and rehabilitation, then the Rundberg community may realize more cost-benefit of grant dollars than any policing initiative, even a cost-effective one such as nuisance abatement.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) is a recognized leader in the cost-benefit analysis of juvenile justice, adult offender, and crime prevention programs. Per WSIPP analysis (2012), several juvenile justice programs have benefits to participants and society that exceed the costs of the program more than twenty-fold. For instance, Functional Family Therapy realizes a benefit of \$20 per every dollar spent, and Aggression Replacement Training realizes a benefit of \$40 per dollar spent.²⁵ For adult offenders, drug treatment in the community (long-term residential treatment and outpatient treatment) yields a benefit of \$11 per dollar spent; in-prison education programs produce a benefit of \$19 per dollar spent; cognitive behavioral therapy has a benefit of nearly \$24 per dollar spent; and employment training and job assistance programs in the community have a benefit of over \$40 per dollar spent. In terms of general prevention programs, the benefit-to-cost ratios are not as great, but many programs still would be regarded as a beneficial investment. For instance, youth mentoring programs such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters yield roughly a \$5 benefit per dollar spent.

²⁵ In contrast, the widely known Scared Straight program, which seeks to deter juvenile offenders through visits to adult prisons, has a detrimental effect. That is, rather than deterring behavior, Scared Straight actually leads to more criminal offending by participants. And for every \$1 spent on Scared Straight, there is a detrimental effect (i.e., a negative benefit) of -\$76 (Washington State Institute for Public Policy 2012; see also the Campbell Collaboration for an extensive review of Scared Straight: www.campbellcollaboration.org/lib/download/13/).

As the RAND Corporation notes (Heaton 2010), research evidence on the comparative cost-benefit of different police personnel (e.g., detectives versus patrol, or management staff vs. front-line personnel) is scarce. It is likely, depending on the circumstances in a given jurisdiction, that the cost-benefit of adding police personnel differs across police functions (e.g., patrol, community policing, investigations, and management). The RAND Corporation estimates through an analysis of the proposed expansion of the Los Angeles Police Department (Heaton 2010) that adding police personnel yields a benefit of up to \$3.80 per every dollar spent, although the extent of the benefit highly depends upon how police resources are deployed.²⁶ While there is evidence that investment in policing can lower crime with a net benefit to society, investments in policing do not appear to yield as much benefit-to-cost as the delinquency prevention, juvenile justice, and especially adult offender programs mentioned above. If the City of Austin's goal through the BCJI/Restore Rundberg initiative is to maximize the benefit-to-cost of the grant resources, then it would be worthwhile to distribute grant resources to offender rehabilitation and reintegration strategies or prevention programs. That being said, nuisance abatement, in contrast to some other policing strategies, has the dual advantage of being a cost-effective way of reducing crime while also providing a foundation for neighborhood revitalization.

Given attention by the City of Austin and the Austin City Council to address substandard housing conditions in the Rundberg community through consideration of a rental registration program and added sanctioning against repeat offenders of housing codes, now is an opportune time for the Austin Police Department to revisit its role in helping to create safe and healthy housing conditions in Austin. In addition to the strides the City of Austin has taken to improve the conditions of housing, a synergistic course of action would be for the City to also focus on criminal nuisance conditions.

²⁶ Related to this point, there is extensive research evidence on what works and what does not work among contemporary police practices (see Sherman 2013 for a recent review).

REFERENCES

- Berrien, Jenny, and Christopher Winship. 2002. "An Umbrella of Legitimacy: Boston's Police Department-Ten Point Coalition Collaboration." In *Securing our Children's Future*, edited by G. Katzmann. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- City of Austin. 2011. *2011-12 Approved Budget*, Volume I. Austin, TX: City of Austin. Available at: https://assets.austintexas.gov/budget/11-12/downloads/fy12_approved_volume1.pdf.
- Cohen, Lawrence E., and Marcus Felson. 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44: 588–607.
- Eck, John, and Julie Wartell. 1998. "Improving the Management of Rental Properties With Drug Problems: A Randomized Experiment." *Crime Prevention Studies* 9:161–85. Available at: http://www.popcenter.org/library/crimeprevention/volume_09/.
- Greenberger, Scott S. 1997. "Crime as a Public Nuisance: 1800s law used to drive drugs, prostitution out of today's neighborhoods." *Austin-American Statesman*, July 1.
- Harmon, Dave. 2013. "At Motels near Rundberg Lane, Managers say Detering Crime Requires Tough Policies and Some Unpleasant Confrontations." *Austin-American Statesman*, May 11.
- Heaton, Paul. 2010. *Hidden in Plain Sight: What Cost-of-Crime Research Can Tell Us About Investing in Police*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, Center on Quality Policing. Available at: http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2010/RAND_OP279.pdf.
- Lejins, Peter. 1967. "The Field of Prevention." In *Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice*, edited by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mazerolle, Lorraine Green, James F. Price, and Jan Roehl. 2000. "Civil Remedies and Drug Control: A Randomized Field Trial in Oakland, California." *Evaluation Review* 24:212–41.
- Office of the Attorney General of Texas. 2011. *Nuisance Abatement*, 15th Edition. Austin, TX: Office of the Attorney General of Texas. Available at: https://www.oag.state.tx.us/AG_Publications/pdfs/nuisance_abatement.pdf.
- Police Executive Research Forum. 2012. *Austin Police Department Patrol Utilization Study: Final Report*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum. Available at: http://austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Police/PERF_Final_Report_-_Austin.pdf
- Rosenbaum, Dennis P., and Amie M. Schuck. 2012. "Comprehensive Community Partnerships for Preventing Crime." In *The Oxford Handbook of Crime Prevention*, edited by Brandon Welsh and David Farrington. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Sampson, Robert J. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 227:918–24.
- Sherman, Lawrence W. 2013. "Targeting, Testing and Tracking Police Services: The Rise of Evidence-Based Policing, 1975-2025. In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Volume 42, edited by Michael Tonry. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Truman, Jennifer L., and Michael Planty. 2012. *Criminal Victimization, 2011*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv11.pdf>.
- Tyler, Tom R., and Jeffrey Fagan. 2008. "Legitimacy, Compliance and Cooperation: Procedural Justice and Citizen Ties to the Law." *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 6: 231–75.
- University of Texas School of Law. 2010. *Texas Problem Properties Toolkit*. Austin, TX: The Community Development Clinic at the University of Texas School of Law. Available at: <http://www.utexas.edu/law/clinics/community/ProblemPropertiesTexasToolkit10web.pdf>.
- University of Texas School of Law. 2013. *Addressing Problem Properties: Legal and Policy Tools for a Safer Rundberg and a Safer Austin*. Austin, TX: The Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic at the University of Texas School of Law. Available at: <http://www.utexas.edu/law/clinics/community/Rundbergproblempropertiesreport%20Final%20August2013%202.pdf>.
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy. 2012. *Return on Investment: Evidence-Based Options to Improve Statewide Outcomes*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Available at: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/12-04-1201.pdf>.
- Weisburd, David, Shawn Bushway, Cynthia Lum, and Sue-Ming Yang. 2004. "Crime Trajectories at Places: A Longitudinal Study of Street Segments in the City of Seattle." *Criminology* 42:283–322.

CITY OF AUSTIN
BYRNE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INNOVATION PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RESEARCH REPORT

Appendix D



Restore Rundberg

COLLECTIVE EFFICACY SURVEY, 2014

Austintexas.gov/restorerundberg

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK | THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
1925 SAN JACINTO BLVD., AUSTIN, TX 78712

1. Please indicate your gender:
 - a) Female
 - b) Male
 - c) Transgender
 - d) Other

2. Please indicate your age: _____

3. Please indicate your race (mark all that apply):
 - a) American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - b) Asian or Asian-American
 - c) Black or African-American
 - d) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - e) White
 - f) Other: _____

4. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin:
 - a) No, I am not Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
 - b) Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, or Chicano
 - c) Yes, Puerto Rican
 - d) Yes, Cuban, Cuban-American
 - e) Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin: _____

5. Please indicate below how many organizations/groups you are an active member of.
Some examples of organizations/groups follow:
 - Church and/or other church-affiliated group
 - Veteran's group
 - Volunteer or Service clubs
 - Labor union
 - Support group
 - Sports group
 - Hobby group
 - Nationality group
 - Farm organizations
 - Professional or academic group
 - Political group (Mexican-American Political Association, etc.)
 - Neighborhood Group (Nextdoor.com, Home Owner's Association, etc.)
 - Any other group membership
 - a) 0
 - b) 1
 - c) 2
 - d) 3
 - e) 4
 - f) 5
 - g) 6
 - h) 7
 - i) 8
 - j) 9
 - k) 10 or more
 - z) I'm not sure if I belong to any groups or organizations

Please choose the most appropriate answer to the following questions:

6. How often do you attend meetings of clubs or organizations such as school groups, unions, fraternal organizations, athletic groups or the like?
 - a) More than once a week
 - b) Once of week
 - c) 2-3 times a month
 - d) About once a month
 - e) Less than once a month
 - f) Never

7. How often do you usually attend religious services. Would you say...
 - a) More than once a week
 - b) Once of week
 - c) 2-3 times a month
 - d) About once a month
 - e) Less than once a month
 - f) Never

8. Besides regular services, how often do you take part in other activities with your religious group? Would you say...
 - a) More than once a week
 - b) Once of week
 - c) 2-3 times a month
 - d) About once a month
 - e) Less than once a month
 - f) Never

9. During the last 12 months, did you do volunteer work for a church or other religious organization, for a political group, a senior citizens' group, or for any other type of organization?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

10. If yes, about how many hours did you spend on volunteer work of these kinds during the last 12 months?
 - a) Less than 20 hours
 - b) 20-39 hours
 - c) 40-79 hours (about 1-2 weeks full-time)
 - d) 80-159 hours (about 2-4 weeks full-time)
 - e) 160 hours or more (4+ weeks full-time)

How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to intervene in various ways if..

11. Children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner?

**Very Unlikely Unlikely Neither Likely
Nor Unlikely Likely Very Likely**

12. Children were spray painting graffiti on a local building?

**Very Unlikely Unlikely Neither Likely
Nor Unlikely Likely Very Likely**

13. Children were showing disrespect to an adult?

**Very Unlikely Unlikely Neither Likely
Nor Unlikely Likely Very Likely**

14. A fight broke out in front of your house?

**Very Unlikely Unlikely Neither Likely
Nor Unlikely Likely Very Likely**

15. The fire station closest to your home was threatened with budget cuts?

**Very Unlikely Unlikely Neither Likely
Nor Unlikely Likely Very Likely**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your neighborhood by circling one of the responses:

16. People around here are willing to help their neighbors.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

17. This is a close-knit neighborhood.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

18. People in this neighborhood can be trusted.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

19. People in this neighborhood generally don't get along with each other.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

20. People in this neighborhood do not share the same values.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

The following questions ask about your neighborhood and the area in which you live.

- 21. How long have you lived in your neighborhood? _____ years
- 22. Listed below are a series of problems that can arise in any area. Please indicate how much of a problem the following are for you:

a. Litter in the streets	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
b. Smells and fumes	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
c. Walking around after dark	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
d. Problems with dogs	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
e. Noise from traffic or other homes	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
f. Lack of entertainment (cafes, cinemas, pubs, etc.)	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
g. Traffic and road safety	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
h. Places to shop	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
i. Vandalism	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem
j. Disturbance by neighbors or youngsters	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem

Thinking about your neighborhood, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

23. I am always looking over my shoulder.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

24. I feel safe in most places without having to be on the lookout for danger.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

25. I'm always on guard for things that might come at me.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

26. I'm not someone who worries about who's coming up behind me.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

27. I'm on my guard in most situations.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

28. I'm pretty relaxed in most situations.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

How often has each of the following occurred in your immediate neighborhood during the past 6 months:

29. A fight in which a weapon was used

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

30. A violent argument between neighbors

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

31. A gang fight

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

32. Sexual assault or rape

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

33. A robbery or mugging

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

34. Prostitution

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

35. Property crime

Often Sometimes Rarely Never Don't Know

36. While you have lived in your neighborhood, has anyone ever used violence, such as in a mugging, fight, or sexual assault, against you or any member of your household anywhere in your neighborhood?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

37. The police in this neighborhood are responsive to local issues.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

38. The police are doing a good job in dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

39. The police are not doing a good job in preventing crime in this neighborhood.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

40. The police do a good job in responding to people in the neighborhood after they have been victims of crime.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

41. The police are able to maintain order on the streets and sidewalks in the neighborhood.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

42. In the past five years, the level of police protection in the neighborhood has:

Gotten better Stayed the same Gotten Worse

43. Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in the United States.

At the **top** of the ladder are the people who are the best off – those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the **bottom** are the people who are the worst off – who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder?

Please place an “X” on the step where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the Rundberg community.



DRAFT