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**EXECUTIVE 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 over 930,000 residents and an estimated 19 million visitors annually. The University of Texas at Austin, BCJI Research Partner, is located in the heart of Austin, with satellite offices throughout the City and with tens of thousands of students housed off campus, in Austin neighborhoods.

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 considerable challenges that comprised a significant proportion of crime within the immediate area as well as citywide. Termed Restore Rundberg, the program continues to be a partnership between the community, government, researchers, nonprofits, and stakeholder groups. The 2014 implementation and research plan provided a detailed overview of the innovative strategies that the City and University rolled out over a 31-month period. The strategies focused on addressing persistent crime, physical and social disorder including substantial population migration and immigration, community engagement (including cultural and linguistic barriers), positive youth development, and the community’s relationship with police.

The Restore Rundberg neighborhood encompasses 5.74 square miles, which is approximately 2% of the city, and is home to 5% of the city’s population (roughly 38,000 people). The neighborhood acts as a gateway for large populations of immigrants and refugees, with about 53 different languages and dialects spoken. Many of the dwellings are multi-family rental units. From 2007 to 2011, the neighborhood accounted for 11% of citywide violent crimes (murder, rape, robbery & aggravated assault), 7% of citywide property crimes (burglary, theft, and auto theft), and 9% of Part II crimes (sex offenses, other assaults, criminal mischief, prostitution, narcotics, weapons violations, and disorderly conduct). Approximately 30% of residents are living below the poverty level. The local school district reports that 95% of the youth attending the six Rundberg schools are considered economically disadvantaged. High levels of poverty, disinvestment, and unemployment – all of which are indicative of the deep-rooted criminal element – have historically discouraged redevelopment and stifled economic growth. The visibility of open-air drug markets, prostitution, nuisance property, and loitering contribute to the unrest. Positive neighborhood attributes include multiple informally organized community groups and a few city-driven, formally organized groups.

This report provides a final analysis of the target area and hot spot crime data, findings from the administration of the Rundberg Community Survey, specific recommendations for the local continuation of cross-sector and community-driven programming, and budget projections and practical suggestions for replication within other neighborhoods nationwide.

For additional information, including copies of all program documentation and in-depth research, please visit the Restore Rundberg website: [www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg](http://www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg). If you have any questions related to the information in this plan, please contact us at Restore.Rundberg@austintexas.gov.
Final Report Key Findings

Crime Analysis

Multiple enforcement and engagement programs were employed in the Restore Rundberg target and hot spot areas: Mobile Walking Beat (MWB), Critical Observations by Police and Community (COPAC), Community Engagement Coordination, Community MarketPlace, Apartment/Landlord Coalition, Rundberg Education Advancement District (R.E.A.D.), Council on At-Risk Youth (CARY), and Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team (RRRT).

The UT research team has determined that the Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP) contributed to a reduction in the proportion of crime attributed to the Rundberg district, with a 2.7% difference since implementation; this finding is consistent with a primary goal of the Restore Rundberg initiative. Crime analysts validated data spanning six years* and concluded that violent crime within each of the hot spot areas was reduced, as follows:

- Hot Spot 1: 53% decrease in violent crime
- Hot Spot 2: 82% decrease in violent crime
- Hot Spot 3: 45% decrease in violent crime

Crime analysts also noted significant reductions in calls for service (data also spanning six years*) within each of the hot spots. Validation is anticipated by the spring of 2017. Unconfirmed data is as follows:

- Hot Spot 1: 45% decrease in calls for service
- Hot Spot 2: 83% decrease in calls for service
- Hot Spot 3: 32% decrease in calls for service

*Actual time period: January 1, 2011 to October 31, 2016

As compared with another Austin community with similar social and structural challenges (Dove Springs), the Rundberg neighborhood experienced significantly less crime during RRP; there were no significant differences between the communities prior to the intervention. When comparing crime trends to those of Austin as a whole, Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP) appears to have contributed to a more resilient community with regard to seasonal crime spikes when compared to the three years prior to the intervention. Moreover, when compared to a comparison hot spot in the Rundberg area that did not receive RRP, there is evidence that the RRP in the intervention hot spots contributed to more effective outcomes (i.e., reduced violent crime and calls for service) than traditional policing strategies. MWB officers have made over 16,000 contacts in the Rundberg area, to date; over two-thirds (67%) of contacts were Hispanic. When residents were asked by officers, “Is this a safe place for you and your family?,” results revealed that only one-third (34%) of residents surveyed in 2014 reported that they “felt safe.” After one year of MWB, that number grew to nearly three-quarters (74%) of residents. This provides a strong indication that perceptions of safety increased significantly in the hot spots.
from 2014 to 2015. Finally, it is worth noting that there were no violent crimes reported during the days and hours that the MWB officers were operating in the designated hot spots.

**Community Survey**

Residents in the hot spots, which had higher rates of crime prior to the start of Restore Rundberg, scored lower on collective efficacy and neighborhood attachment on the community survey. During the second wave of the survey, residents reported more positive perceptions of police in the hot spots, suggesting that the community policing effort is helping to develop a trusting relationship between hot spot residents and the police even in the face of other challenges. These findings reflect positive impacts of RRP community-policing models. Future efforts should continue to focus on developing collective efficacy and social cohesion to reduce neighborhood crime and increase attachment in a sustainable manner. These efforts should be strongly grounded in a framework of cross-sector collaboration that spans systems - including the University, Austin Police Department, Austin Independent School District, City of Austin Planning and Zoning Department, Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team, local businesses and government, neighborhood teams, residents, nonprofits, and volunteers.

**Key Recommendations**

**Recommendation #1 (MWB & COPAC):** The UT research team recommends that the Austin Police Department (APD) continue to deploy mobile walking beat shifts 4 to 5 times each week in the hot spots with a schedule that continues to factor in the times and days that violent and property crimes are most prevalent. APD crime analysts should continue to study crime within existing hot spots and assist officers with staffing each location based on need (tapering off in areas that have moved to the revitalization stage and adding new hot spot areas of concern). The UT research team further recommends against low or zero-tolerance enforcement initiatives and pro-arrest operations, as these strategies were shown to have little to no impact on crime during the program’s planning year. Ongoing resource needs for this programming include officer overtime, the quick tap survey app and iPads.

The UT research team recommends that the City sets aside funding and allocate resources to better develop the Critical Observations by Police and Community (COPAC) stat system. The utilization of this extremely resourceful tool proved to both lower violent crime and calls for service. This will have a two-part effect that then provides officers with more time to continue to implement community policing strategies. The UT team suggests that the COPAC stat system be integrated into the Computer Automated Dispatch systems CAD, and work with both Fire and EMS on extrapolating pertinent data. Once COPAC data is received, the UT team suggest that this information be used at both rapid response and COMPSTAT meetings to help make more impactful and efficient responses to place-based crime.

**Recommendation #2 (Restore Rundberg Marketplace):** The UT research team recommends the continued implementation of education and outreach within 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. Along with these topics the Marketplace can assist immigrant residents. 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 allow for the most efficient use of public safety resources and lead to a better quality of life for all – regardless of place of origin or resident status. In general, the public safety class will be 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.

**Recommendation #3 (Apartment/Landlord Coalition):** The Apartment/Landlord Coalition component of RRP has been very challenging due to the transient population and turnover of management/owners. Even so, the UT research team recommends that APD district representative officers or the APD Office of Community Liaison take the lead in continuing apartment/landlord coalition efforts within each of the hot spot areas. Such coalitions 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 ongoing leadership training. Ongoing resources needs include officer overtime, food, giveaways and guest speakers.

**Recommendation #4 (Community Engagement Coordinator):** The UT research team recommends that the City hire a permanent full-time, City-funded, community engagement coordinator to assist with place-based public safety related initiatives. The budget for such a position, reasonably funded at $25 per hour, with benefits (FICA/Medicare, healthcare and retirement), would total approximately $79,500. The UT research team understands that it may not be possible to dedicate an FTE to one area of the City and therefore recommends that a position be created to serve two or more place-based RRP-modeled opportunities, to include the Rundberg neighborhood.

**Recommendation #5 (R.E.A.D. & CARY):** The UT research team recommends that the City or Austin Independent School District consider setting aside funds for the Rundberg Education and Advancement District (R.E.A.D.) and the Council on At-Risk Youth (CARY) to continue direct programming within R.E.A.D.-designated schools. Funding for these youth and parent engagement projects range in funding from $50,000 to $150,000 annually and target the most high-risk students within the hot spot areas.

**Recommendation #6 (Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team):** The UT research team conducted an Implementation and Process Report in 2015. The last section of this report examined processes specific to the priority areas addressed by the Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team, and is accessible at the Restore Rundberg website: www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg. The UT research team recommends that the City continue to provide resources for the Revitalization Team on an as-needed basis, to include meeting space, facilitation services for retreats, neighborhood planning consultation services, and guest speakers.
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List of Key Research Activities

The University of Texas at Austin, in partnership with APD:
- 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 initial hours of direct observations of the crime hotspots
- Collected crime, census, observational, and qualitative data with constant analysis and re-analysis of impact, effectiveness and necessary refinement;
- Examined the community’s perceptions of crime, through dialogue, focus groups, correspondence, surveys and all other available means;
- Studied displaced and diffused crime;
- Surveyed hot spot residents to assess collective (community) efficacy and general feelings of safety and well-being in the hot spots.
The research team met on a regular – typically weekly basis – by phone, with the University presenting periodic research updates to the City and Rundberg Revitalization Team. The University made several final recommendations for program implementation within identified hot spot locations and within the greater target area:

- Employ a mobile walking beat (hot spots)
- Improve community engagement efforts
  - Enhance the community marketplace (target area)
  - Coordinate an apartment/landlord coalition (hot spots)
  - Hire a community engagement specialist to assist with a well-defined list of activities (target area)
- Contract for juvenile justice direct programming (target area)

**Target Area – Site Summary**

The target area was chosen based on:

- high levels of poverty, disinvestment, unemployment, and criminal activity
- visibility of open-air drug markets, prostitution, nuisance property, and loitering on street corners, in parking lots, and around homes and businesses

Image 1: Restore Rundberg Target Area
Hot Spots

Restore Rundberg hot spots were determined using police crime data (911 calls and police-generated reports) over a seven-year period, from 2007 to 2013. The analysis was initially limited 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. Following the majority of year one 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 three selected hot spots represent areas of concentrated Part I and Part II crimes. The crime problems remained consistent over the last seven years. Residents and direct observations confirmed 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 catered to quick encounters and criminal activity, with in and out access (gas stations, convenience stores, smoke shops, liquor stores).

For many residents, the high visibility of crime was suggestive of a lack of police presence. The lack of community engagement within the targeted hot spots was quite evident. Those residing in and visiting the area were reluctant to cooperate with police, exhibited a general mistrust (creating hot spots of distrust) and were 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 fend for themselves even when resources that may assist in their ability to raise their standard of living are 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.

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.
Overall, these three original hotspots accounted for 21% of crime in the Rundberg area and almost 12½% of crime citywide. Approximately 91.5% of perpetrators were male, with over 50% Hispanic. The majority of crime victims were male (80%) and Hispanic (66%). Youth under 17 years old comprise approximately 30% of the BCJI target area population. (It is worth noting that a fourth hot spot became an active target in April 2016.) Hot spot analysis reflected some marked difference in the days of crimes occurring (Monday through Sunday) with higher rates on Saturday and Sunday. Overall, crime was occurring every day of the week with some peaks on the weekends but not at a hugely disproportionate rate when the three hot spots were considered in aggregate. Timing of criminal activity ran from late afternoon to early morning on the weekends (Friday to Saturday) but during the weekdays crime occurred from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.
## Description of Hot Spots

| Hot Spot 1 | The first hot spot encompasses the area around the intersection between the major highway (I-35) and the primary arterial thoroughfare (Rundberg Lane) in the neighborhood. The physical environment, specifically the road organization, a strip of inexpensive hotels, and a 25-acre plot of dense, undeveloped land, present attractors for drug and prostitution activity. |
| Hot Spot 2 | The second hot spot is a residential cul-de-sac (Sam Rayburn Drive) located parallel to a vacant plot of land. Historically, the collection of low-rent, multi-unit residential properties has attracted high levels of drug and gang activity. |
| Hot Spot 3 | The third hot spot (Northgate Blvd) is a residential street segment located directly south of the area’s major arterial thoroughfare (Rundberg Lane). The primary risk factors are a collection of vacant properties and active nuisance small business (e.g., two liquor stores). |
| Hot Spot 4* | In response to concerns around crime displacement, crime data, and officer observations, a fourth hot spot became an active target in April 2016. South of hot spot 2, a dense residential area bordered by Wonsley Drive, Georgian Drive and I-35 has a combination of commercial and roadway risk factors. |

*Hot Spot 4 is not one of the original three hot spots identified at the beginning of Restore Rundberg, but became an active target in April 2016 in response to concerns about crime in this residential area.

## Program Goals and Objectives

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. The objectives included with the original grant proposal remained the same over the 4-year grant period, with each tied to one or more measurable outcomes.

- 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
- 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
- Establish effective partnerships, both to provide solutions along the continuum and commit resources to sustain what works
- Enhance the Restore 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
• Assess program implementation in collaboration with The University of Texas at Austin and other research partners, and plan for sustainment of effective strategies with private and public funding.

Strategies, Research and Activities

During the 17-month planning period (October 2012 to February 2014), the City and UT research team worked with neighborhood leaders, stakeholders, individual community members and the Restore 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. Over the 31-month implementation period, the cross-sector partnership followed a BJA-approved plan to reduce violent and property crime, build trust between community members and police officers, improve place-based awareness of emergency and non-emergency City resources, and build the capacity of the community to improve neighborhood revitalization outcomes. Planning, implementation and ongoing research reports that detail the progression of enforcement, engagement and revitalization components are available on the program’s website (listed below).

This report provides a final analysis of the target area and hot spot crime data, findings from the administration of the Rundberg Community Survey, specific recommendations for the local continuation of cross-sector and community-driven programming, and budget projections and practical suggestions for replication within other neighborhoods nationwide.

For additional information, including copies of all program documentation and in-depth research, please visit the Restore Rundberg website: www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg. If you have any questions related to the information in this plan, please contact us at Restore.Rundberg@austintexas.gov.

Final Crime Analysis and Trends

At the beginning of the Restore Rundberg project, the neighborhood was statistically the largest crime hot spot of Austin. According to 2012 crime statistics, the 5.74 square-mile Rundberg area accounted for about 5% of total residents, but 12.58% of all violent crime. In the seven years prior to the start of Restore Rundberg, the area experienced 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 discouraged redevelopment and economic growth.

Data

Retrospective and real-time data was collected from the Austin Police Department crime statistics department to track Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP) crime reduction goals. Crime was analyzed separately by Part I violent crime [Homicide, Rape, Robbery, and Aggravated Assault] and Part II property crime [Burglary, Theft]. Domestic and family violence related crimes are excluded from the analysis. Crime incidents were organized based on date of
occurrence (as opposed to reported time) using only the highest offense code of the incidence if multiple crimes occurred during a single recorded incident.

The overall project goals were a 5% decrease in violent and property crime by the grant end date. Additionally, the overall percentage of Rundberg violent crime to overall Austin violent crime was expected to be reduced by 1%. Crime within the hot spots and grant area were analyzed separately; however, project goals focused on crime reduction in the overall grant area. Additionally, displacement, the relocation of crime from one place, time, target, offense, or tactic to another (Guerette, 2009), and diffusion, the reduction of crime in areas related to the targeted efforts (Guerette, 2009), were examined.

Crime Density

The overall impact of the Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP) on the concentration and geographic distribution of crime in Rundberg was considered as an estimate of displacement and diffusion. The original hot spots were identified using 911 calls and police-generated calls involving Part I (violent) and subsequently Part II (property) crimes from 2007 to 2013 (see Image 3). The concentration was determine using a kernel density calculation with ArcGIS software. The procedure fits a smoothly curved surface over the geographic location of each crime incident. The distance between incidents establishes the surface value, which is highest at the location of the point and diminishes with increasing distance from the point relative to a user set search radius distance. The kernel function is based on the Silverman (1986) quartic kernel function. The three original hot spots were chosen from 7 possible high density areas; Image 3 shows all seven areas. The three original hot spots were chosen with consideration to qualitative data from the police personnel responsible for the area, community meetings and agency contacts, local residents, and systematic observations of built environments elements of disorder.

Image 3. Pre-Intervention High Concentration Areas

To compare crime density pre- and post-RRP, a similar kernel density technique was administered with a subset of Austin crime data. The incident locations of Part I violent crime occurring between January 2012 and April 2014 were mapped and analyzed in Image 4. Overall, six areas of high concentration persisted between the original kernel analysis (Image 3) and the updated analysis (Image 4); two of the areas of high concentration on Lamar Blvd in the original
analysis were consolidated into one larger hot spot in the updated violent crime analysis. The relative size and crime concentration of the IH 35 and Rundberg Lane (Hot Spot 1), Sam Rayburn Drive (Hot Spot 2), and Northgate Blvd (Hot Spot 3) areas remained consistent.

Image 5 shows the kernel density procedure as applied to Part I violent crime occurring April 2014, the start of RRP, through September 2016, the end of the no-cost extension period for the grant. Visual comparisons of Images 4 and 5 were used to determine areas of possible crime displacement and the likelihood of shifts in incident concentration. All three of the selected hot spots remained areas of high relative concentration in the post-intervention analysis. No new areas of high concentration emerged since the original analysis. The IH 35 and Rundberg Lane hot spot emerged as having the highest relative concentration of incidents since April 2014. Given the physical risk factors of the area, such as the cluster of inexpensive hotels and motels, gas stations, convenience stores, and fast food restaurants, its persistence of crime clustering was expected relative to other micro-geographies in the grant area. The change of magnitude of crime concentration in Hot Spot 1 relative to Hot Spots 2 and 3 may signal disproportionate crime reduction in the entire area (as opposed to shifts only in the hot spots). Similarly, the reduction of intensity in the Sam Rayburn and Northgate areas may signal the shift in crime incidents. With the kernel analysis of the three hot spots, the visual inspection alone cannot confirm a reduction of crime in those areas.

Hot Spot Crime

Crime incidents within the hot spots were tracked to monitor any patterns that could inform operational strategy and officer deployment. RRP directly engaged the areas with the greatest clustering of crime. Any statistical differences in crime that occurred within the micro-geographies were difficult to identify due to the relatively low counts of crime incidents (particularly violent crime) within the hot spots. A diffusion of positive effects throughout the grant area was expected based on Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP). While MWB was focused on the hot spots, officer visibility was increased throughout the grant area, as they drove in and out, worked at neighborhood schools, and frequently attended community meetings and events. Foot patrols are believed to 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).

Charts 1 and 2 present line graphs of the property and violent crimes that occurred within the hot spots from January 2012 to September 2016. Hot Spot 4 data was tracked from April 2015 to September 2016. All three original hot spots experienced slightly fewer crime incidents after the start of the MWB (April 2014 to September 2016) as compared to the months preceding the intervention (January 2012 to March 2014). Hot Spot 1 experienced, on average, 10.88 property crimes per month before RRP. Since the initiation of RRP, Hot Spot 1 experienced a decline of 2.31 incidents monthly (8.57/month). For Hot Spots 2 and 3, the property crime pre-/post-intervention differential was -.51 and -.80, respectively. Differentials in violent crime were smaller, but mirrored the direction of the changes in average property crime. Monthly violent crime was reduced by .05, .18, and .22, respectively, across the three original hot spots.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hot Spot #1</th>
<th>Linear (Hot Spot #1)</th>
<th>$y = -0.002x + 95.205$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot Spot #2</td>
<td>Linear (Hot Spot #2)</td>
<td>$y = -0.0006x + 27.027$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Spot #3</td>
<td>Linear (Hot Spot #3)</td>
<td>$y = -0.0014x + 66.187$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Spot #4</td>
<td>Linear (Hot Spot #4)</td>
<td>$y = -0.0038x + 162.6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant Area – Violent Crime

The reduction of Part I violent crime was a key focus of Restore Rundberg, as the area has historically seen a disproportionate amount of violent crime relative to the size of its population. Within the analysis, Part I violent crimes are defined as murder, aggravated assault, robbery by assault, robbery by threat, aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon, arson, rape, sexual abuse, and deadly conduct. Table 1 displays the annual totals of violent crime, excluding incidents identified as family and dating violence.

In Table 1, crime incidents within the grant area are compared to the level of overall crime within the City of Austin and within a comparison neighborhood that did not receive Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP). Dove Springs was selected as the comparison neighborhood based on similarities of geographic extent, built environment risk factors, and socioeconomic characteristics. For the purposes of analysis, the geographic parameters of the Dove Springs comparison area are IH 35, Ben White Blvd., and William Cannon Drive. Both the grant and comparison areas experienced a reduction of crime from 2012 to 2013, which was consistent with an overall crime reduction throughout the City of Austin. For the next two calendar years, Austin as a whole and Dove Springs in particular experienced an increase in violent crime that
approached 2012 levels. The grant area maintained a small, but consistent, reduction in crime from 2012 to 2015.

Table 1. Violent Crime (excluding family and dating violence), raw count for Austin, Grant, and Comparison Area, 2012 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Austin</td>
<td>2186</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Area</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Area</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to comparing the three original hot spots to Dove Springs as a comparison neighborhood, we also examined Violent Crime and Calls for Service in one of the original comparison hot spots, located in the Rundberg area. This comparison hot spot is located in the area of Rutland Drive, Rundberg Lane, and Lamar Blvd. Rather than the community policing MWB approach, this area continued to receive traditional police services during the grant period. Where we saw a decrease in violent crime in all three of the original hot spots, this comparison hot spot experienced a drastic and sharp increase in violent crime.

Crime analysts validated data spanning six years* and concluded that violent crime within each of the hot spot areas was reduced, as follows:

- Hot Spot 1: 53% decrease in violent crime
- Hot Spot 2: 82% decrease in violent crime
- Hot Spot 3: 45% decrease in violent crime

Crime analysts also noted significant reductions in calls for service (data also spanning six years*) within each of the hot spots. Validation is anticipated by the spring of 2017. Unconfirmed data is as follows:

- Hot Spot 1: 45% decrease in calls for service
- Hot Spot 2: 83% decrease in calls for service
- Hot Spot 3: 32% decrease in calls for service

From January of 2011 to September of 2016, the Rundberg comparison hot spot of Rutland Drive, Rundberg Lane, and Lamar Blvd. experienced a 78% increase in calls for service, and a 93% increase in Part I crimes*.

*Actual time period: January 1, 2011 to October 31, 2016

This data provides yet another indication that the Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP) in the intervention hot spots contributed to more effective outcomes (i.e., reduced violent crime and calls for service) when compared to a similar, comparison hot spot in Rundberg. The entire grant target area saw a 4.5% reduction in violent crime, indicating that the RRP resulted in the diffusion, and not the displacement, of crime.
One shortcoming of the crime statistics analysis was the inability to capture the exact population characteristics (i.e., demographics, growth rate) of the grant area. The primary challenge was due to the grant area geographic parameters not exactly matching those of administrative records. Another was the transient nature and immigration status of the population. The Rundberg area has a larger population of residents who are not citizens of the United States; higher than 25% according to the City of Austin’s Demographics Department (2011). Approximately 64% of the population speaks languages other than English and approximately 59% have limited English proficiency.

Table 2 shows a contrast of violent crime statistics that attempts to limit the effect of potential population variation. The proportion of violent crime that occurred in the grant and comparison areas relative to the City of Austin as a whole are displayed. An original goal of Restore Rundberg was to reduce this proportion by 1% by the grant end date. In 2015, the proportion of violent crime in Austin attributed to the Rundberg area reached a four-year low at 11%, a 2.7% reduction from the year prior to RRP implementation, thus exceeding the original goal set at the start of the grant.

Table 2. Percentage of Austin’s Violent Crime Occurring within the Restore Rundberg Grant Area and Comparison Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Austin Violent Crime</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Area</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Area</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
<td>13.15%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the RRP start date (April 2014), the research team considered potential seasonal effects of crime incidents pre- and post-RRP. Chart 3 displays monthly violent crime incidents between January 2012 and September 2016. In each of the four years, there was an increase of violent crime in Austin overall during the summer months (May to July). This confirmed the likelihood of a seasonal effect of violent crime that through visual inspection seems to be mirrored in the grant area numbers – though the grant area appears generally less responsive to crime spikes, indicating that there is a positive buffering effect for Rundberg.

**Grant Area – Property Crime**

Due to the distribution of apartment complexes and high-risk commercial properties (e.g., convenience stores, liquor stores) the impact of the Restore Rundberg initiative on property crime in the area was important to track. Chart 4 displays monthly violent crime incidents between January 2012 and September 2016. All property crime was tracked; however, the majority of property crime fell into four categories: auto theft, burglary of vehicle, burglary of residence, and theft. Image 6 shows the geographic location of property crime before and during RRP relative to the land use characteristics of the grant area. The clustering of crimes around the high risk areas was confirmed via visual inspection for both time periods.
Though the clustering of crime remained consistent pre- and post-RRP, the actual number of incidents declined in both the grant and comparison areas. This reduction was commensurate with the overall trend of property crime in the entire City of Austin. Table 3 displays the total amount of property crime in all three areas. The City of Austin experienced a 16.64% reduction of property crime from 2013 to 2015. Over the same time period, the grant and Dove Springs comparison areas experienced a 16.08% and 16.65% decline, respectively. Table 4 displays the relative percentage of property crime attributed to the grant and comparison areas. From 2012 to 2015, there was a minimal reduction of the proportion of crime in both areas.
Table 3. Property Crime for Austin, Grant, and Comparison Areas, 2012 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>43816</td>
<td>41319</td>
<td>36592</td>
<td>34442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Area</td>
<td>3512</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>2999</td>
<td>2652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Area</td>
<td>4060</td>
<td>3531</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>2943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Percentage of Austin’s Property Crime Occurring within the Restore Rundberg Grant Area and Comparison Area, 2012 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Austin Property Crime</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Area</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Area</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grant Area – Overall Crime Reduction**

Visual inspection of geographic clustering and trend analyses provide some insights on the relative changes in violent and property crime incidents prior to and during the implementation of RRP. Overall, there was a reduction of all crime from 2012 to 2015; however, compared to Austin as a whole and the Dove Springs comparison neighborhood, only the reduction in violent crime was unique to the grant area receiving the intervention. For both violent and property crime, a series of mean differences tests were conducted \((p<.05)\) comparing the two neighborhoods during pre-intervention (January 2012 to March 2014) and intervention (April 2014 to September 2016) periods.

Table 5 displays the results of the significance tests and period incident averages. For violent crime, there was no significant difference of violent crime within the grant area before and during RRP. There was a significant difference between the grant and comparison areas during the intervention that was not apparent prior to the intervention. In other words, it appears that RRP combined with community engagement strategies may have served as a protective factor for the grant area, limiting the impact of the overall increase of violent crime throughout Austin. For property crime, the reduction of incidents in the grant area prior to RRP and during implementation was significant. The difference between the grant and comparison areas remained significant in both time periods. This finding is consistent with the overall reduction of property crime experienced in Austin from 2012 to 2016.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Grant Area</th>
<th>Comparison Area</th>
<th>Significant Difference?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Intervention</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>33.59</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Period</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Difference?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Grant Area</th>
<th>Comparison Area</th>
<th>Significant Difference?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Intervention</td>
<td>272.96</td>
<td>310.78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Period</td>
<td>226.76</td>
<td>261.43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Difference?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further analysis was conducted on the specific types of crimes that were occurring before and after the intervention to give insight to modifying RRP as necessary. Table 6 highlights the most common subtypes of Part I and Part II crimes occurring in Austin and the grant area. The 2016 statistics account for incidents taking place between January 1st and October 1st. The overall decline in crime in both areas has been largely driven by property crime reduction – specifically, significant reductions in burglary. The most significant reduction in violent crime in both Austin and the Rundberg grant area has been aggravated assault. Despite the overall decline in violent crime in the grant area, the increase of violent crime incidents since 2013 and the increase of aggravated robbery and murder in 2016 are points for continued attention. Table 7 highlights the most common subtypes of Part I and Part II crime for each of the three original hot spots.

Table 6. Crime by Type (Violent & Property) and Predominant Subtype: Austin & Grant Area, 2012 - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Robbery</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery (Assault/Threat)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary of Vehicle</td>
<td>13249</td>
<td>12300</td>
<td>9922</td>
<td>9357</td>
<td>6298</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary of Residence</td>
<td>5268</td>
<td>4571</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>3224</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>12410</td>
<td>11870</td>
<td>10665</td>
<td>10276</td>
<td>7369</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Crime by Type (Violent and Property) and Predominant Subtype by Hot Spot, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Robbery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery (Assault/Threat)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary of Vehicle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary of Residence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Analyses – Calls for Service and MWB iPad Survey

Calls for Service

In addition to crime incidents, residents’ calls for service were tracked during MWB. Generally, interpreting meaning from a call for service depends on the type, timing, and outcome of call. To evaluate the impact of MWB on perception of crime, Chart 4 displays the rate of change in calls from October 2014 to September 2016 along with monthly property and violent crime incidents. Choosing a start period 6-months post-implementation was hypothesized to capture the impact of the intervention on perceptions of safety, as opposed to engagement effects based on increased officer visibility in the initial months of MWB.

To compare the crime incidents with the calls for service the slopes of the respective regression line (x-intercept) were used to estimate the average rate change. Calls that were deemed non-actionable were excluded from the analysis. The declining rate of change (-.13) was largest for the calls for service compared to the rate of change for property crime in Rundberg (at a rate of -.05) and the rate of change for violent crime, which was slightly positive (.02).

MWB iPad Surveys

MWB officers have made over 16,000 contacts in the Rundberg area, to date; over two-thirds (67%) of contacts were Hispanic, matching the demographic in the area, serving to bridge the gap between traditional police-community meetings that showed little multicultural interaction. The iPad survey results (N = 1,044) were analyzed by the UT research team. This survey was treated more like a conversation between officers and residents. The primary question focused on whether the person felt safe. If the answer was yes, officers would use it as an opportunity to hand out information about neighborhood associations and resources available in the city. If the person advised that they did not feel safe, officers would ask why and annotate their responses. These responses were used to create several different categories. From this data, officers were able to learn what the crime perceptions of the community were and from that, determine what could be done in order to make the community members feel safer. This was an opportunity to gauge the effectiveness of the community policing efforts in a way that did not tie directly into crime statistics. The main community concerns were as follows: Homeless, Drug Dealing, Drug Use, Suspicious Persons, Crime (general), Prostitution, and Public Intoxication.

Wave 1 of the survey was conducted in 2014, and Wave 2 was conducted a year later in 2015. Among other questions, residents were asked by officers, “Is this a safe place for you and your family?” The results revealed that only one-third (34%) of residents surveyed in 2014 reported that they “felt safe.” After one year of RRP, that number grew to nearly three-quarters (74%) of residents. This provides a strong indication that perceptions of safety increased significantly in the hot spots from 2014 to 2015.
Rundberg Community Survey

The section of the report describes the administration and results of the Rundberg Community Survey.

Methods

Survey Design

The survey included demographic questions and measures of five dependent variables of interest: perceptions of police, perceived neighborhood safety, neighborhood attachment, collective efficacy, and social cohesion. All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale. A copy of the survey (in both English and Spanish) is attached in the Appendix of this report. Some items were drawn from other surveys, and some were developed by the research team in partnership with the Austin Police Department.

Perceived Neighborhood Safety. Four items were used to measure participants’ feelings of safety in their neighborhoods. General perceived safety (“I feel safe in my neighborhood”), perceived safety walking during the day as well as at night, and perceptions of safety in parks or playgrounds in the neighborhood were assessed.

Neighborhood Attachment. Three items were used to assess participant’s neighborhood attachment. These items measured participant’s desire to move or stay in the neighborhood by asking for agreement on these statements: “I would like to move out of my neighborhood”; “I like my neighborhood”; and, “If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood I currently live in.”

Collective Efficacy: Social Cohesion and Social Control. The construct of neighborhood collective efficacy, or the shared willingness to intervene for the public good (Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowley, 2002), is made up of the combined concepts of social cohesion and social control. Five items were used to measure social cohesion: “This is a close-knit neighborhood”; “People around here are willing to help their neighbors”; “People in this neighborhood generally get along with each other”; “People in this neighborhood can be trusted”; and, “People in this neighborhood share the same values.” These items were drawn from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson et al., 1997). Three items were used to measure social control, which were also based on questions from the same seminal work, but were altered to fit the specific needs of Restore Rundberg. The questions used in the Rundberg Community Survey focused on whether respondents believed neighbors would be likely to take action on community resource issues, including closing of a public school, closing of a public library, and budget cuts to a local fire station. The item on the closing of a public school was removed for the surveys administered in the local elementary schools at the request of the School District, and is therefore excluded from the analyses. Only the question on the closing of a local fire station was retained.

Perceptions of Police. Five items measured agreement on a 5-point Likert scale with statements about the police. One item on the response of police to neighborhood concerns, “The police are doing a good job in dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood”, was
drawn from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). The other items measured interaction with police (“I have talked with police officers in my neighborhood lately”), visibility of police (“The police are noticeably present/highly visible in my neighborhood”), response to police presence (“I like seeing police officers in my neighborhood”), and satisfaction with police officers (“I am satisfied with the police officers who serve my neighborhood”).

**Survey Development**

A draft version of the survey was piloted by administering the survey for a limited period of time at a frequently used community agency (a YMCA located in the grant area). The survey was revised following the pilot phase. The final survey was translated to Spanish and back-translated to English (see Appendix). Respondents provided the nearest intersection to their home, which was used to determine if they lived within a crime hot spot receiving Restore Rundberg Programming (RRP).

**Sampling**

Purposive sampling was used to engage participants door-to-door, online, and at community events, and surveys were sent home with all students attending Austin ISD elementary schools within the Restore Rundberg grant area. All of the door-to-door surveys were administered within the three original hot spots receiving RRP.

**Survey Administration**

The Rundberg Community Survey was administered in English and Spanish to residents who live and/or work in the community, online, in-person, and on paper forms. In-person administration of the survey was conducted by members of the research team and students from The University of Texas at Austin, many of whom were able to administer the survey in English and Spanish. In-person surveys were administered at community events and door-to-door. Surveys were sent home with elementary school students in the grant area. Online surveys were sent to neighborhood association email lists, made available at computer workstations and the library and YMCA, and distributed electronically to community agencies.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive analyses were used to describe the sample. To assess differences between participant groups, mean survey scale scores for residents receiving RRP were compared to scores of residents not receiving RRP using independent samples t-tests.

**Reliability Analysis**

Internal consistency reliability of each scale (perceived neighborhood safety, neighborhood attachment, and social cohesion) were assessed using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. A scale is said to be reliable to the extent that it performs consistently, and the coefficient alpha is the most frequently used method to estimate reliability (Abell, Springer, & Kamata, 2009).

The questions on perceptions of police were considered as independent questions.
The scale measuring social control was reduced by one item at the request of the school district; we chose to no longer consider the remaining two items as a scale and only analyzed the item “How likely is it that your neighbors would organize together if the fire station closest to your home was threatened with budget cuts?” This item was chosen as it was the item with the longest standing history of use in other studies, and had nearly the exact same mean as the remaining question on the likelihood of taking action if the library was threatened to be closed \( [M=2.40, SD = 1.00 \text{ vs. } M=2.49, SD=1.05, \text{ respectively (n=568)}]. \)

**Descriptive and Multivariate Analyses**

Descriptive statistics and chi-square analyses were used to examine the characteristics of the sample. Mean survey scale scores for residents of crime hot spots receiving RRP were compared to both scores of residents not receiving RRP using independent samples t-tests.

**Results**

**Participants**

A total of 611 surveys were completed. Survey participants identified as 57.4% Latino/a, 26.8% White, 5.4% Black, and 10.2% other race/ethnicity (see Figure 1). Participants were 64.6% female. The majority of the participants reported renting their homes (64.3%) (see Figure 2). The majority reported living in the Rundberg area (n=559, 91.5%), while the remaining participants reported working in the Rundberg area (n=17, 2.8%), or living and working in the Rundberg area (n=35, 5.7%). Participants reported living in the Rundberg area for an average of 9 years (SD=9.6 years, range 0 to 46 years).

Two-thirds (n=408, 66.8%) of the participants provided enough information about the nearest intersection to their home for their location to be coded as either within the RRP boundaries or not within the boundaries. Of these, 165 (40.4%) resided in crime hot spots that received RRP. The remaining 243 lived in the grant area but did not receive RRP.

Participants who received the RRP intervention were significantly different than those who did not in terms of race/ethnicity and homeowner status (see Table 8). Participants who received RRP were significantly more likely to identify as non-white than participants who did not live in the RRP boundaries (79.7% vs. 36.2%, \( \chi^2 (2, N = 408) = 81.6, p \leq 0.001 \)).

**Survey Administration**

The highest proportion of the surveys were collected through paper forms sent home with students in area elementary schools (39.3%, n=240). The remainder were collected online (20.8%, n=127), door-to-door in the hot spots (19.8%, n=121) and at community events (20.1%, n=123). Over one-third were completed in Spanish (n=235, 38.5%). Table 9 provides a breakdown of survey location by language.
Figure 1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants by Race/Ethnicity

![Pie chart showing the distribution of survey participants by race/ethnicity.]

- Latino/a: 351 (58%)
- White: 164 (27%)
- Black: 33 (5%)
- Asian: 13 (2%)
- Other: 42 (7%)
- Missing: 8 (1%)

Figure 2. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants by Homeownership Status

![Pie chart showing the distribution of survey participants by homeownership status.]

- Renter: 393 (65%)
- Homeowner: 197 (33%)
- Other: 14 (2%)
- Missing: 8 (1%)

26
Table 8. Demographic Characteristics of Participants, Total Sample and by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=611)</th>
<th>Received RRP (n=212)</th>
<th>Did not receive RRP (n=196)</th>
<th>Location not coded (n=203)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/AA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeownership*</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=604)</th>
<th>Received RRP (n=212)</th>
<th>Did not receive RRP (n=196)</th>
<th>Location not coded (n=196)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>78.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Language*</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=611)</th>
<th>Received RRP (n=212)</th>
<th>Did not receive RRP (n=196)</th>
<th>Location not coded (n=203)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>49.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>50.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The differences in characteristics between the participants who received the RRP and those who did not is statistically significant (p<0.05).

Table 9. Survey Administration by Method and Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-Door</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As described in the crime analysis section, participants within the RRP hot spot boundaries lived in areas that had higher rates of crime at the start of *Restore Rundberg*, as compared to those who do not live within the boundaries. It is expected that residents in high crime areas would report lower scores on collective efficacy, social cohesion, neighborhood attachment, and feelings of safety. In comparisons of participants’ ratings (see Table 10), those in the RRP hot spots had significantly lower scores on collective efficacy, indicating less perceived social control of the neighborhood, and on neighborhood attachment, indicating a higher desire to leave their neighborhoods. Scores on social cohesion, which reflect feelings of trust and closeness with neighbors, and perceived neighborhood safety, were not significantly different. This indicates that despite higher rates of crime, respondents in the hot spots felt as much trust in their neighbors and felt as safe as respondents outside of the hot spots (see Table 10).

Table 10: Mean survey scores, comparing residents who received RRP to those who did not receive RRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received RRP</th>
<th>Did not receive RRP</th>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Control</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Attachment</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Safety</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, residents who received RRP, when compared to those who did not, reported statistically significant higher ratings on three of the five police-related survey items: police response to neighborhood concerns, satisfaction with police, and visibility of police (see Table 11). These responses reflect desired effects of RRP as a community policing approach.

Respondents who lived in the RRP hot spots differed demographically from those who did not, but statistical tests (ANOVA) to assess differences in perceptions of police by racial/ethnic group were not statistically significant, meaning perceptions of police did not vary significantly by group. In each of the three largest racial/ethnic groups (Latino/a, White, Black), perceptions of police were significantly higher among those who lived in the RRP hot spots compared to those who did not, as is the case for the larger sample (see Table 12).
Table 11. Mean survey scores on police-related survey items, comparing residents who received RRP to those who did not receive RRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received RRP</th>
<th>Did not receive RRP</th>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Police</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Police Presence</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Response to Neighborhood Concerns</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Police</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of Police</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Mean survey scores, comparing residents who received RRP to those who did not, by race/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latino/a</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive RRP</td>
<td>Received RRP</td>
<td>Did not receive RRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>9.09*</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference is significant, $p \leq 0.05$

**Discussion and Implications from Community Survey**

The community survey is limited by purposive sampling. Additionally, about one-third of participants did not provide enough information about the nearest intersection to their home for their location to be coded, and therefore those participants could not be included in the hot spot / non-hot spot comparisons. Residents in the RRP hot spots, which had higher historical rates of crime, scored lower on collective efficacy and on neighborhood attachment than residents not in the hot spots. Residents of the RRP hot spots reported higher perceptions of police scores, suggesting that the community policing effort is helping to develop a trusting relationship between hot spot residents and the police even in the face of other challenges. These results indicate support for the RRP model of community policing, and the overall Restore Rundberg effort. Future police efforts should continue community policing approaches, and contain a community building mechanism that focuses on developing collective efficacy and social cohesion to reduce neighborhood crime and increase neighborhood attachment in a sustainable manner.
Restore Rundberg Programming Replication

This section of the final report, the Replication Guide, provides an overview of key implementation activities that constitute the core of the Restore Rundberg effort. The purpose of this section is to describe in some detail important activities and efforts, and where appropriate, to provide recommendations for the sustainability of Restore Rundberg.

All implementation activities were designed to be interconnected, for instance:

- Police officers that participate in mobile walking beat and apartment/landlord coalition also contribute to the juvenile justice services component
- The University of Texas works with APD to resolve crime solutions while also contributing students and classwork time (masters and undergraduate levels) to assist with Team priorities
- The juvenile justice contractor works closely with police officers and the community engagement coordinator to reduce youth risk factors
- The community engagement coordinator assists with all strategies and all project components report to the Team and community at monthly meetings

Mobile Walking Beat

Based on unique features of the neighborhood and previous research on the benefits of community policing, the Restore Rundberg team initiated a Mobile Walking Beat (MWB) in April 2014. The approach is informed by the “criminology of place,” a synthesis of prominent sociological theories that attributes the clustering of crime to the interplay of physical features of environment and the convergence of the population around certain parts of neighborhood (Sherman, 2013; Sherman, Gartin, & Buerger, 1989). Micro-geographies where residents routinely congregate become destinations for likely criminals, where certain environmental features (e.g., poor lighting, vacant buildings and lots) reduce the likelihood of being apprehended. Similarly, the social characteristics of a neighborhood, such as lower levels of community engagement and trust between neighbors, are believed to influence the likelihood of crime at smaller units of geography (i.e., blocks, intersections) (Weisburd, Groff, & Yang, 2012). Effective interventions must consider the social dimensions of communities along with the features of the physical environment and the routine activities of residents. The limited effectiveness of one-dimensional policing strategies that only target the criminal activities (e.g., 100% enforcement strategies) may be attributed to narrowly focused objectives.

For Rundberg’s Mobile Walking Beat, the patrols aimed to deter crime and engage local residents. Mobile walking beat operations typically consisted of 6 to 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 were scheduled for these overtime and regular-duty assignments, up to four 6-hour shifts per week. Additional personnel were added for transportation purposes as needed. The advantage of the beat’s mobility was that the supervisor could move the walking beat from one hot spot to another or into surrounding areas based on the needs of the moment. Such tactics gave the impression of a larger force and provided more visibility.
Officers were trained to better engage the community while working in the hot spot areas by keeping track of their informal conversations with residents, business owners and commuters around their perceptions of the neighborhood, crime issues, and daily occurrences. Officers made connections with business owners/workers, residents, and children in each of the areas, while assisting with emergency and non-emergency spotting out crime and suspicious activity. These “community-intensive” activities enabled officers to learn informal community leaders to further community engagement. APD was responsible for the logistical operation of the walking beat and the UT researchers worked in cooperation with APD to train police and develop evaluation tools to track community engagement and monitor crime. Initial training took place during months 1 and 2 of implementation and follow-up instruction occurred throughout the two-year period.

The research team monitored mobile walking beat activities with the help of APD crime data, regular meetings with police on the beat, and daily activity sheets. MWB officers also collected data, using iPads, to help identify community concerns, reduce language barriers, and improve perceptions. Along with the social environment data collected by Restore Rundberg researchers, the patrol data was merged with the daily crime incidents and calls for service tracked in each of the hot spots. Information was collected during a shift included requests for improvements of physical conditions, actual enforcement interventions, arrests, personal/non-crime assistance provided, and number of interactions (non-crime related). Officers documented the place and time of each interaction and descriptions of the community members with whom they interacted. Data collected from the walking beat tracked not only the impact on criminal activity but also fed into community engagement, in terms of informing the community engagement specialist and potential partners of needed physical improvements and services.

A “How To” guide for the MWB is included in the Appendix.

**COPAC**

During the initial phase of the MWB, the Region II District Representatives saw that they were getting more information that indicated the root cause of the problems in the area by combining information received from both officers and community members. The Region II DR’s assigned triggers to stat sheets so that they could account for the concerns of the resident contacts. The DR’s then researched all violent crime reports within the hot spot and used the same triggers to identify the underlying issues. Some examples of the triggers are homelessness, vacant property, drugs, juvenile, and mental health. The DR’s coined this Stat process Critical Observations by Police and Community, or COPAC (see Appendix for one-page visual depiction of COPAC).

Here is how we have seen COPAC work. During the Restore Rundberg project we checked all of the violent crime reports and identified triggers. We then examined all of the data, which revealed that while there were several triggers present, homelessness was much more prevalent than previously believed. Homeless individuals were represented in 44% of the violent crimes, either as a victim or as a suspect. In response to this information, command staff assembled a team that included a cross-sector partnership between the police department, homeless advocates, nonprofits and health services to address the problem.
After the COPAC approach was employed, violent crime in one hot spot was reduced by 29%. Over a 6-year period, from 2011 to 2016, we saw a 53% reduction in violent crime. When isolating the homelessness trigger, it is notable that the homeless population went from being a suspect/victim in 44% of violent crime cases to having zero documented involvement by the end of 2015.

**Recommendation #1 (MWB & COPAC):** The UT research team recommends that the Austin Police Department (APD) continue to deploy mobile walking beat shifts 4 to 5 times each week in the hot spots with a schedule that continues to factor in the times and days that violent and property crimes are most prevalent. APD crime analysts should continue to study crime within existing hot spots and assist officers with staffing each location based on need (tapering off in areas that have moved to the revitalization stage and adding new hot spot areas of concern). The UT research team further recommends against low or zero-tolerance enforcement initiatives and pro-arrest operations, as these strategies were shown to have little to no impact on crime during the program’s planning year. Ongoing resource needs for this programming include officer overtime, the quick tap survey app and iPads.

The UT research team recommends that the City sets aside funding and allocate resources to better develop the Critical Observations by Police and Community (COPAC) stat system. The utilization of this extremely resourceful tool proved to both lower violent crime and calls for service. This will have a two-part effect that then provides officers with more time to continue to implement community policing strategies. The UT team suggests that the COPAC stat system be integrated into the Computer Automated Dispatch systems CAD, and work with both Fire and EMS on extrapolating pertinent data. Once COPAC data is received, the UT team suggest that this information be used at both rapid response and COMPSTAT meetings to help make more impactful and efficient responses to place-based crime.

**Restore Rundberg Marketplace**

During the planning year, the APD district representative officers began hosting a weekly Tuesday night meeting at the YMCA, which 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. At the outset, meetings were consistently held at 6:00 p.m., same place and location weekly, remained informal, and officers developed good relationships with those who do not typically attend community meetings. Weekly attendance averaged between 15 and 25, and increased over time.

Starting in February 2014, one meeting per month focus on a particular problem within the community as identified by participants. Marketplace topics included 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.

The Restore Rundberg Marketplace was 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 was advertised using community members 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 allow for the most efficient use of public safety resources and 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.

**Recommendation #2 (Restore Rundberg Marketplace):** The UT research team recommends the continued implementation of education and outreach within 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. Along with these topics the Marketplace can assist immigrant residents. 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 allow for the most efficient use of public safety resources and lead to a better quality of life for all – regardless of place of origin or resident status. In general, the public safety class will be 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.

**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 occurs 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.

**Recommendation #3 (Apartment/Landlord Coalition):** The Apartment/Landlord Coalition component of RRP has been very challenging due to the transient population and turnover of management/owners. Even so, the UT research team recommends that APD district representative officers or the APD Office of Community Liaison take the lead in continuing apartment/landlord coalition efforts within each of the hot spot areas. Such coalitions 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 ongoing leadership training. Ongoing resources needs include officer overtime, food, giveaways and guest speakers.
Community Engagement Specialist/Organizer

The community engagement and police approach is largely about capacity building. The person in this role previously has held a range of primary duties to include:

- Track and manage asset and resource lists for the hot spot areas;
- Provide administrative support for the Rundberg Education and Advancement District;
- 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.

Recommendation #4 (Community Engagement Coordinator): The UT research team recommends that the City hire a permanent full-time, City-funded, community engagement coordinator to assist with place-based public safety related initiatives. The budget for such a position, reasonably funded at $25 per hour, with benefits (FICA/Medicare, healthcare and retirement), would total approximately $79,500. The UT research team understands that it may not be possible to dedicate an FTE to one area of the City and therefore recommends that a position be created to serve two or more place-based RRP-modeled opportunities, to include the Rundberg neighborhood.

Juvenile Justice Direct Services Programming

The research team recognized that 30% of the BCJI target area was youth under the age of 17, and that the vast majority were considered low income and at risk for involvement in the criminal justice system. The direct services approach addressed many crime issues and assisted in building the infrastructure needed to provide youth with better options to become positive contributors to this area and to avoid criminal options.

Rundberg Education and Advancement District

The Rundberg Education and Advancement District (R.E.A.D.) is an initiative that focuses on revitalization. Throughout the implementation of the grant, several common concerns continued to arise from the community. The proposed structure of R.E.A.D. was designed to address these concerns (see Appendix for a more detailed description of R.E.A.D.).

The R.E.A.D. mission is to collaborate with parents, educators, schools, and city officials to encourage and support the educational advancement of youth. Through neighborhood development and school participation, R.E.A.D. provides a hub for the community and creates a vibrant healthy corridor that will improve the quality of life for generations to come.
The City contracted with a local non-profit, the Council on At-Risk Youth (CARY), to complete direct services within the target area.

CARY’s referral criteria included students with at least one documented disciplinary report in AISD’s TEAMS database system. The reports were coded as a behavior of aggression, abuse, assault, gang activity, or possession of weapons or drugs on school grounds. School principals, assistant principals and/or counselors made referrals to CARY Youth Advisors at the respective schools. To achieve the goal of diverting youth from the juvenile justice system, CARY focused on 50 elementary school students, ages 10 and 11, transitioning into middle school and deeply involved in the school disciplinary system. CARY also focused on 50 middle school students at Dobie, aged 12 to 14 years of age, as well as 50 incoming 9th graders at Lanier high school for a total of 150 students who would receive intensive Aggression Replacement Training (ART), a well-established evidence-based practice. In addition, the entire Dobie Middle School campus, approximating 700 students, received a universal intervention using ART. All 850 students were enrolled in the Austin Independent School District (AISD) and resided in the target area.

Recommendation #5 (R.E.A.D. & CARY): The UT research team recommends that the City or Austin Independent School District consider setting aside funds for the Rundberg Education and Advancement District (R.E.A.D.) and the Council on At-Risk Youth (CARY) to continue direct programming within R.E.A.D.-designated schools. Funding for these youth and parent engagement projects range in funding from $50,000 to $150,000 annually and target the most high-risk students within the hot spot areas.

Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team

APD is very fortunate to have a strong volunteer base that comprises the “Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team.” The Team continues to act in an advisory capacity, with Team meetings providing regular forums for community discussion. The fifteen-member group focuses on eight priority objectives that are separate from but affected by crime issues, including economic development, affordable housing, healthcare, homeless intervention and prostitution prevention. The Team is the most significant sustainability component as their revitalization efforts will continue well beyond the grant end date.

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 (see Image 7 below)
- A draft community-driven revitalization structure was created
- The Rundberg Revitalization Team membership was increased, from 5 to 15 members (over the 4-year period)
The Rundberg Revitalization Team detail and documents are available for replication on the program’s website: [http://austintexas.gov/department/restore-rundberg-teams](http://austintexas.gov/department/restore-rundberg-teams).

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.

**Recommendation #6 (Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team):** The UT research team conducted an Implementation and Process Report in 2015. The last section of this report examined processes specific to the priority areas addressed by the Restore Rundberg Revitalization Team, and is accessible at the [Restore Rundberg](http://www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg) website: [www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg](http://www.austintexas.gov/restorerundberg). The UT research team recommends that the City continue to provide resources for the Revitalization Team on an as-needed basis, to include meeting space, facilitation services for retreats, neighborhood planning consultation services, and guest speakers.
Restore Rundberg Recognition

Over the last four years, the Restore Rundberg Program has received several recognitions including:

- Austin Community Advancement Network’s 2015 Butler Award – The Spirit of Collaboration Award
- Austin City Council Distinguished Service Award, 2015
- The 100 Club of Central Texas Outstanding Service Award, 2016
- Center for Problem Oriented Policing, Herman Goldstein Excellence in Problem Oriented Policing, 2016 (Finalist)
- *Austin Chronicle*’s Best Neighborhood Revitalization Effort, 2016

Awards received by Dr. David Springer, PI of the research team at The University of Texas at Austin, in recognition of his work on Restore Rundberg:

- Selected as a recipient of the *Public Service Matters Spotlight* Award, Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA).
- Selected to the *Nonprofit Times Power & Influence Top 50*, a national list of the top working executives in the nonprofit sector.
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APPENDIX

SUPPORTING MATERIALS
Please have one adult complete this survey, and only one survey per household. Thank you!

Section One: About You

1. Today's date: _____ / _____ / 2015
   (Month) (Day)

2. What is your zip code? __________

3. What is the nearest intersection to your home? ____________________________

4. How long have you lived in the Rundberg community? _______ years

5. How old are you? (circle one category):
   - 18-24
   - 25-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60-69
   - 70-79
   - 80 or older

6. Please circle your gender: Female  Male  Other

7. Please indicate your race/ethnicity (check all that apply):
   - Mexican or Mexican-American, Central American, South American, Other Latino/a or Hispanic
   - African-American, Black, or African
   - Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, or from India
   - White, Caucasian, or European (including people from Spain)
   - Arabic or Middle Eastern
   - Other - please specify: ___________________________________________________

8. Is your home or apartment:
   - Rented?
   - Owned with a mortgage?
   - Owned without a mortgage?
   - Lived in without payment of money or rent
   - Other
Section Two: Your Neighborhood. Please answer these questions by marking the circle for your response. You can use a check mark (✓), an X, or fill in the circle.

In your neighborhood, how likely is it that your neighbors would organize together if:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The local public library was threatened to be shut down?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The fire station closest to your home was threatened with budget cuts?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>People around here are willing to help their neighbors.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>This is a close-knit neighborhood.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>People in this neighborhood can be trusted.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>People in this neighborhood generally get along with each other.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>People in this neighborhood share the same values.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please tell us the top 3 problems in your neighborhood.

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________
**How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel safe in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel safe walking in my neighborhood during the day.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel safe walking in my neighborhood at night.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There are safe parks or playgrounds in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I would like to move out of my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I like my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood I currently live in.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about police officers in your neighborhood:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. I have talked with police officers in my neighborhood lately.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I like seeing police officers in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The police are doing a good job dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The police are highly visible in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am satisfied with the police officers who serve my neighborhood.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments or suggestions:**

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________

**THANK YOU!**
Por favor, solamente un adulto por casa completa esta encuesta y solamente una encuesta por domicilio/familia. Gracias!

Parte uno: Sobre usted

1. Fecha de hoy: _______/_____/2015
   (Día)   (Mes)

2. Indique su código postal ___________

3. ¿Cuál es la intersección más cercana a su casa? ____________________________

4. ¿Indique cuantos años ha vivido en la comunidad Rundberg? _______ años

5. ¿Cuál es su edad? (Escoge una):
   18-24   25-29   30-39   40-49
   50-59   60-69   70-79   80+

6. Indique su sexo:  Femenino  Masculino  Otro

7. Indique su raza (marque todo lo que sea pertinente):
   □ Mexicano/a o Mexicano Americano, Centroamericano/a, Sudamericano/a, Otro Latino/a o
   Hispano/a
   □ Negro/a o Afroamericano/a
   □ Asiático/a o Asiático Americano/a
   □ Blanca (incluyendo gente de España)
   □ Árabe o de Oriente Medio
   □ Otra raza:

8. La casa o apartamento donde usted vive ahora:
   □ Usted la renta
   □ Usted es dueño y paga una hipoteca
   □ Usted dueño y no paga una hipoteca
   □ Está ocupado sin pago o renta
   □ Otro
Parte dos: Su vecindario.
Por favor indique su respuesta en la forma usando (✓), (X), o marque todo el circulo.

En su vecindario, ¿qué tan probable es que sus vecinos se organizarán juntos si:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy probable</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Poco probable</th>
<th>Muy poco probable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. ¿La biblioteca pública más cercana a su casa sea amenazada de cierre?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ¿La estación de bomberos más cercana a su casa sea amenazada debido a recortes en el presupuesto?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Por favor, indique hasta qué nivel usted está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones sobre su vecindario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Las personas que se encuentran a mí alrededor están dispuestas a ayudar a sus vecinos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Se puede confiar en la gente de este barrio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. La gente en este vecindario, por lo general, se llevan bien entre sí mismos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Las personas en este vecindario comparten los mismos valores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Enumere los tres problemas principales en su vecindario.

1. ____________________________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________________________
Por favor, indique hasta qué nivel usted está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Me siento seguro/a en mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Me siento seguro/a caminando en mi vecindario durante el día.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Me siento seguro/a caminando en mi vecindario por la noche.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Hay parques seguros y parques infantiles seguros en mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Me gustaría mudarme de mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Me gusta mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Si tuviera que mudarme, echaría de menos el vecindario donde vivo ahorita.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Por favor, indique el nivel con el cual usted está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones sobre la policía en su vecindario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>He hablado con la policía que está caminando en mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Me gusta ver la policía en mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>La policía hace un buen trabajo con los problemas que realmente le preocupan a la gente de este vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>La policía está presente y visible en mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Estoy satisfecho con la policía que sirven a mi vecindario.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comentarios o sugerencias:

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

GRACIAS!
Restore Rundberg Program
Mobile Walking Beat
Replication Guide

“One of the most critical components of effective law enforcement is the establishment and maintenance of public trust. Though vital to public safety, its existence is often taken for granted. But as recent events have demonstrated, examining your relationships with your community is essential to maintaining law and order.” COPS Website

“Officers who walked their beats gain far greater empathy and understanding of neighborhood concerns than those who rode in police vehicles. Likewise, citizens felt safer and believed the police were far more responsive to their concerns.” Dr. Lee Brown, Policing in the 21st Century (p. 72).

Overview
This guide was created by the Austin Police Department, Region 2 District Representative officers to help explain the implementation of the Mobile Walking Beat (MWB). The MWB proved to be one of the most important tools during the Restore Rundberg operation and continues to help both decrease crime and improve community efficacy. The MWB is unique from other walking beats as it can move from one hot spot to another without the need for significant operational changes. As every department is different, this is only a guide. We added lessons learned to help others that wish to replicate the MWB.

Vision and Mission
The goal of this operation was to create an initiative that is highly effective, highly visible and focuses on connecting and engaging with residents and business owners. This grass roots approach to enforcement establishes credibility between the police and the community. The resulting cross-cultural relationships allow officers to become respected guardians of the community.

Preparation
Once we understood that we wanted to use a walking beat approach, we researched how to implement walking beats successfully (see Chart 1a). The Rundberg neighborhood has a dense population – an area too large for traditional foot patrols – so we built upon the traditional model, scheduling deployments according to ongoing crime analysis in each of the three hot spot areas. We formed eight-officer teams to intentionally saturate one hot spot at the same time, focusing on each hot spot for a minimum of 45 minutes. This gave the appearance that officers were in all of the hotspots at the same time throughout the shift, essentially making eight officers seem more like 24 officers. The District Representatives continue to use the SARA model to help resolve MWB issues (see Chart 1b).
Establish a Goal
The goal of each walking beat officer was to have as many public contacts as possible. It is imperative to the success of the operation that the officers understand the goal and intention of the operation. A training session was created for all officers that would be working the MWB. The class was given by the District Representatives (Community Liaison Officers) and each class ended with the Region Commander explaining his vision for the operation. He explained that the measures of success would be based on community engagement – through documented contacts made with individuals – and not measured by tickets or arrests.

Operational Goals
Establish goals for the MWB project. Set up timed phases utilizing the SARA model so that you can set bench marks and test short-term success (see Chart 1e)

Lessons Learned
When introducing innovative approaches to policing, try to utilize command level supervisors to explain the purpose of the initiative and to explain the intent of the operation. This will help build buy in from the line officers.

Stat Sheet (Data Collection Planning)
A stat sheet was created to identify contacts, demographics and key concerns, including feelings and perceptions of safety (see Chart 1b). The stat sheet was used in SARA update meetings to formulate the best responses for the concerns of the residents. Following up with community members helped officers build credibility within the neighborhood. (Note: the stat sheet assisted project staff with creating the initial survey as recommended by COPS in Chart 1a.)

Lesson Learned
If you have a control area (i.e., another hot spot similar to the one receiving the MWB, but that is receiving traditional policing), survey that area in the beginning and at the end of your operation. This allows you to better identify and compare key findings.

Implementation
Each hotspot was divided into four quadrants. A two-person team was responsible for each quadrant (see Chart 1c). At the beginning of every MWB shift, the DR’s would review any pertinent information or situations that needed responses from previous MWB shifts. The supervisor was responsible for scouting out the other hot spots and moving the MWB team based on foot traffic and time. The entire MWB shift would start in Hot Spot 1 and move on the supervisor’s command. Flyers (English and Spanish) were handed out during the MWB to help educate the public (see Attachment 1d). The MWB initially used hand-written stat sheets and later used iPads and an app called quick tap survey http://www.quicktapsurvey.com/. This app helped streamline data collection and bridge language barrier gaps, as it was translated to multiple languages. The iPads with the survey proved to be an effective icebreaker and helped continue conversations between officers and community members. At the end of every MWB shift, an After Action Review was completed, in which all of the important responses were collected and used for future shifts as well as to track lessons learned.
The following are key initiatives that a department can use to pave the way for foot patrols to succeed:

- Determine the date, time, and location of service calls by type, and create representative maps to aid in efficient and effective deployment.
- Complement statistical analysis with a community survey to obtain the opinions of residents and business owners regarding priority issues.
- Invite the community to participate in planning sessions.
- Recruit a range of individuals (both officers and civilians) to use various models of patrol, demonstrating that both police and civilians can address public expectations through a variety of approaches such as volunteer efforts with neighborhood watch programs and crime-prevention programming.

Strategic Planning

Foot patrols should be developed as part of a proactive, integrated problem-solving strategy and not as a reactive response to an incident. The following are useful steps for developing and deploying successful foot patrols:

- Establish a structure for long-term implementation and evaluation. Plan, coordinate, and integrate program development, training, technology, and community outreach consistent with the objectives of the foot patrol and create evaluation criteria prior to implementation.
- Establish criteria for locating foot patrols in the community. Developing criteria such as identified community problems, unique needs, crime data, and special populations allows strategic deployment of resources in a proactive manner, rather than in response to incidents.
- Establish overarching program goals and objectives for implementing each foot patrol/beat location. Use foot patrols to improve community relations, suppress or prevent crime, or a combination of these objectives. Each objective is viable, yet requires a different approach and should be customized to the needs of the area.
- Establish baseline information on the foot patrol area to assist with developing strategies. An audit of the businesses, schools, social service agencies, parks, shopping areas, and other features in the specific foot patrol area allows the department to better understand areas that could benefit from the foot patrol and will assist with planning the community policing strategy.
- Establish focused areas for the implementation of foot patrols. Conduct a community survey to provide information on the community perceptions of safety needs that can be addressed through foot patrols. Most important, it allows community stakeholders to express ways through which they can support community and department priorities.
The SARA Model

A commonly used problem-solving method is the SARA model (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment). The SARA model contains the following elements:

**Scanning:**
- Identifying recurring problems of concern to the public and the police.
- Identifying the consequences of the problem for the community and the police.
- Prioritizing those problems.
- Developing broad goals.
- Confirming that the problems exist.
- Determining how frequently the problem occurs and how long it has been taking place.
- Selecting problems for closer examination.

**Analysis:**
- Identifying and understanding the events and conditions that precede and accompany the problem.
- Identifying relevant data to be collected.
- Researching what is known about the problem type.
- Taking inventory of how the problem is currently addressed and the strengths and limitations of the current response.
- Narrowing the scope of the problem as specifically as possible.
- Identifying a variety of resources that may be of assistance in developing a deeper understanding of the problem.
- Developing a working hypothesis about why the problem is occurring.

**Response:**
- Brainstorming for new interventions.
- Searching for what other communities with similar problems have done.
- Choosing among the alternative interventions.
- Outlining a response plan and identifying responsible parties.
- Stating the specific objectives for the response plan.
- Carrying out the planned activities.

**Assessment:**
- Determining whether the plan was implemented (a process evaluation).
- Collecting pre- and post-response qualitative and quantitative data.
- Determining whether broad goals and specific objectives were attained.
- Identifying any new strategies needed to augment the original plan.
- Conducting ongoing assessment to ensure continued effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hot Spot</th>
<th>Quad</th>
<th>FEAL Safe</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Email or Phone</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operation Name:** Mobile Walking Beat

**Date:**

**Officer #1**

**Officer #2**
(Chart 1d: Example Hot Spot 1 Rundberg Lane)
Contactos:
Asociación Heritage Hills Neighborhood
http://heritagehillsaustin.com/
Asociación Windsor Hills Neighborhood
https://sites.google.com/site/windsorhillsonline/
Equipo de contacto North Lamar
http://rlit.wordpress.com/
Asociación North Austin Civic
http://www.naca-austin.org/
Colaboración vecinal del Norte de Austin
http://www.northeastaustin.com/
Programa de Defensa Laboral
512-391-2305
Código de Cumplimiento de la Ciudad
512-974-1970
Austin Energy
512-494-8400
311 De Mi Emergencia
Calles y Puertas de Austin
Eliminación de grafitti
Representantes del Distrito 2 del
Departamento de Policía de Austin
(512) 974-5098

Restauran Rundberg fue diseñado para combinar la delincuencia de la delincuencia, para hacer frente a la delincuencia y para evitar el borro de Rundberg. El programa está siendo financiado por el Programa de Innovación de la Policía de Austin Fund, que fue diseñado para eliminar los barrios de alto delincuencia y ayudar a barrios con oportunidad.

Considera conectarse con tu vecindario en Nextdoor.com

Department of
Policía de Austin
Restauran Rundberg
Paquete de Información
para la Comunidad

Vigilancia de Vecindad
Vigilancia de Vecindad ocupa menos tiempo de lo que la mayoría de gente piensa. No se necesita un grupo grande de personas, ni mucho tiempo ni muchos recursos. Usted puede comenzar con sólo hacer "los cinco"

Los Cinco
1. ALERTA - Si ve a alguien que es su vecino y que viene en su casa, ¡sí que anochece! Asegúrate de que la mayoría de gente piense en su casa.
2. LUCHAS - Mi número de teléfono para mis vecinos es a mano, por si acaso. Sabemos que los niños de los vecinos vendrán a mi casa en busca de ayuda. Podría decidir a los bomberos, los vecinos y los niños hay en mi casa en caso de un incendio en mi casa.
3. RESPONSABLE - Llame al 311 y 311, cuando vea un problema potencial. Pido sin número de incidente y lo reporto a la Vigilancia de Vecindad para que se haga un registro. Las personas potenciales a los vecinos para que se hagan un registro. Mantenga mi porte libre de desorden. Rojo basura en mi casa, controlo el grafitti, ayuda a mis vecinos que necesitan ayuda. Quiero que los crímenes sean que mi calle esté cuidada y sus actividades no sean toleradas.

The Department of
Police Restoran Rundberg
Community Information Packet

The Austin Police Department
Restore Rundberg

Neighborhood Watch
Neighborhood watch takes less time than most people think. It does not have to take a large group of people, lots of time and lots of resources. You can start by just doing "the five"

The Five
1. ALERTA - I know who my neighbors and who their kids are. I know what cars belong on my street.
2. LUCHAR - My house is well lit at night. I have installed motion detectors or lights to dawn lights in areas where people may walk.
3. EMERGENCIA - I am ready for a crisis and keep neighbors phone numbers handy, just in case. I know neighbors’ kids would come to my house for help. I could tell the firefighters how many pets and kids to save if there was a fire on my street.
4. RESPONSABE - I call 311 and 911 when I see a potential issue. I ask for an incident number and report it to the Watch so it can be recorded. I bring bigger issues to my Neighborhood Association so the community is aware of what is happening.
5. RESPUESTA - I keep my street and my home neat. I trim my bushes and trees so wind and doors are seen. I keep my drive and porch free of clutter. I pick up trash on my street, handle graffiti, and drugs to help other neighbors who need a hand. I want criminals to see that my street is cared for and their activities will not be tolerated!
Chart 1e

**Phase 1**
Apr 2013-Aug 2014
Community outreach, survey
100% Enforcement, Study crime data

**Phase 2**
Sep 2014-Dec 2014
Response, Mobile Walking Beat, Implement Increase Diversionary programs, Target Frequent Focus, School programs

**Phase 3**
Jan 2015-on
Implement R.E.A.D., Rebrand area, change aesthetics, School programs, G.R.E.A.T., Continue Restore Rundberg Team Priorities
R.E.A.D. is an initiative that emerged from the Restore Rundberg grant, which focuses on revitalizing the Rundberg area. Throughout the implementation of the grant, several common concerns continued to arise from the community. The proposed structure of R.E.A.D. is designed to address these concerns.

MISSION

The R.E.A.D. mission is to collaborate with Parents, Educators, Schools, and City Officials in order to encourage and support the educational advancement of the youth in the Rundberg area. Through neighborhood development and school participation, R.E.A.D. provides a hub for the community and creates a vibrant healthy corridor that will improve the quality of life for generations to come.

ANALYSIS

The area surrounding Rundberg has been plagued with high crime rates for years. Contributing factors to the high crime rate have historically included a lack of business opportunities and large-scale community engagement, as well as the high call volume in this area. The local school district reports that 95% of youth attending the six Rundberg schools are considered economically disadvantaged. High levels of poverty, disinvestment, and unemployment – all of which are indicative of the deep-rooted criminal element – have historically discouraged redevelopment and stifled economic growth. The Austin Police Department Region 2 District Representative officers worked with neighborhood associations, educators, parents, other city entities and nonprofits to create a new district, named the Rundberg Educational Advancement District. (R.E.A.D.). The R.E.A.D. team was able to identify the needs of the youth in the area and work together to improve the educational advancement by focusing on three core areas: Beautification, Youth Resources, and Communication.

RESPONSE

By having three separate teams taking on these aspects, R.E.A.D. has enough structure to ensure that each of these areas of work gets the time and attention they need, while keeping things simple and democratic. These teams should meet on a monthly basis, and the co-leaders of each team should also meet monthly. Each team determines and finalizes their purpose and the projects they will work on.
Lessons Learned

Try to involve PTAs (Parent Associations) as soon as possible. Find the hard-working, engaged parents that volunteer their time and work closely with them. In some of our schools we had no PTAs, so we worked with school Parent Support Specialists as well. This can be very difficult and time consuming at first. Try to break up the workload with team members. Connect the PTA and Neighborhood associations. They often want similar things but sometimes don’t work with each other.

Implementation

Perform an Asset Inventory of the area of concern. This will give you a good idea of what resources are available. Try to not reinvent the wheel; instead, find out who is doing what and learn from them. As Law Enforcement Liaisons we want to bridge as many gaps as we can. Once the Asset Inventory is complete, try to create a meeting with representatives from as many different resources as possible. Utilize the neighborhood association websites and leaders to help establish the need for educational districts or any other name for the district that may be needed to help change perceptions in an area of place-based crime. Develop goals together. Utilize as many members of the community as possible. Holding strategy sessions with the community will help build credibility and create a team atmosphere. These sessions should be activity based (see Chart 1a).

Utilize all members of the community. Remember to involve the youth as well. The R.E.A.D. team created a student council and surveyed the students in the area. They asked the students if they felt safe in the area and if not, why not. Student representatives then reported their findings to key stake holders in the area. This helped formulate the response from the R.E.A.D. team.
This also helped secure a $350,000 grant from the Texas Department of Transportation to beautify a major intersection at the entry point of the neighborhood.

Lessons Learned: Create Team leads as soon as possible

Create a Brand

If an area suffers from place-based crime along with CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) issues there may be a brand issue. The area may be known for nefarious activity. R.E.A.D. held a logo contest with the schools in the area to create a logo for the community district (see Chart 1b). This helps build “buy in” from the community and creates a sense of ownership. Once a logo has been created try and get it out as much as possible. While T-shirts and Feather banners cost money, they can go a long way. Creating fundraisers and goals (e.g., festivals and T Shirts) supports the mission of the community and helps build a sense of teamwork (see Chart 1c).

Social Media

Create Social Media pages as soon as possible. This is free and can help gain further support within and outside of the community (see Chart 1d). This is an excellent way to communicate upcoming events and reinforce to the community the great work that they are doing.

Lessons Learned

Be aware of assets that may be competing for similar resources (i.e., Public schools and Charter schools, or local nonprofits). Utilize established goals to help create a team approach. Keep teams focused on benchmarks that are working towards shared short-term and long-term goals [e.g., working with PTA’s and Student Government to get donations for R.E.A.D. shirts that will be worn by students at the next Spring Festival is a short-term goal; a continued focus on safety in the area that has assisted in the continued reduction in school suspensions and improved attendance and grades in the R.E.A.D. schools is a long-term goal (see Chart 1e)].

SARA

We utilized the SARA model throughout each of the Restore Rundberg Projects. Attached is a logic model of how to utilize the SARA model in long-term planning programs (see Chart 1e).
Rundberg Educational Advancement District (R.E.A.D)
Meeting Agenda
Wednesday April 22nd 2015
4:30pm-6:30pm
Gus Garcia Recreation Center
***Food and Refreshments Provided***

Objectives of Meeting:
1. Introduce ourselves, envision a Rundberg Educational Advancement District and propose a team structure for R.E.A.D;
2. Determine purpose and projects for each team;
3. Nominate and elect two leaders for each team. Set date to orient new team leaders
4. Vote and announce winner of R.E.A.D. logo contest

➢ Activity 1
4:30-4:40 (10 min)

➢ Activity 2
4:40-5:00 (20 min)
Introductions and Envisioning R.E.A.D. What does an ideal Rundberg Education Advancement District look like to you?

➢ Activity 3
5:00-5:05 (5 min)
Propose a Team Structure For R.E.A.D. Project. R.E.A.D. could be made up of three teams.

➢ Activity 4
5:05-5:45 (40 min)
Determine purpose and projects for each team. What team do you want to be a part of?

➢ Activity 5
5:45-6:00 (15 minutes)
Nominate and elect two leaders for each team. Who should lead each team?

➢ Activity 6
6:00-6:10 (10 minutes)
Set date to transition and next meeting date. When is the next meeting?

➢ Activity 7
6:10-6:20 (10 minutes)
Announce winner of R.E.A.D. logo contest. Who won the logo contest and what is the R.E.A.D. logo going to look like?
Be part of the Rundberg’s future!

Go to http://www.read-edu.org/

Select Take Action, Select Donate

This will take you to a READ partner website. Launchpad from this website you can both make a tax deductible donation and view what Launchpad does for our youth in the area.

Please forward this to as many contacts as possible.

Facebook.com/RundbergEducationalAdvancementDistrict

Help rebrand Rundberg!
Support our schools!

As of August 2015, there are nine five schools along Rundberg Lane, between North Lamar Boulevard and Dessau Road: Doole Middle School, Harmony Science Academy, Guatemala Thompson ES, Barrington ES, IDEA

Together, they form the Rundberg Educational Advancement District

READ Focus Areas:
- Connection of the youth with available resources.
- Beautification projects.
- Rebranding of the area