BEYOND CONTAINMENT

Reevaluating What's Important to Improve Public Safety in Richmond

Produced by the Richmond Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney

JANUARY 2019

PREFACE

In the last ten years, Richmond's crime rate has trended downward[1], like most mid-sized cities. Although property crimes persist in some hot-spots, last year's homicide rate was markedly lower than the peak levels that made us the "murder capital of the South."[2] Yet crime remains frustratingly prevalent. It affects all of us, silently costing our city precious municipal resources, stunting our economic growth, and stressing the health and well-being of residents.

In the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office, we have had a front-row seat to a recurring and tragic drama in our neighborhoods and courtrooms. Children lose fathers to incarceration, and mothers lose far too many sons to gun deaths. In schools, teachers struggle to balance classroom management needs with learning needs. In certain neighborhoods residents refuse to assist police efforts to identify violent offenders. In fact, some of the communities most affected by crime seem to have altogether lost faith in the criminal justice system. The response to demands for a safer city has generally been to double down on the status quo: arresting offenders, confiscating drugs and weapons, and trying to increase convictions and sentences.

Some degree of response and containment is necessary for short-term improvement. Over time, however, we have learned that incarceration and or conviction actually do little to deter chronic crime because neither addresses the triggers for criminal behavior.

As Richmond's leaders search for a new police chief and begin a new year of policy-making, we urge city leaders and community residents to consider whether there is a more effective way to address public safety and prevent crime. We can begin this conversation by acknowledging some important questions: Are "apathy" or "personal choice" truly the most relevant underlying causes of crime? Or do larger systemic and societal forces come into play? Even further, are there ways in which local policies perpetuate instability and harm, driving individuals to a criminal decision point?

Criminal decision-making is extremely complicated. It is tempting to be drawn in by partisan soundbites of social ills and income disparity on one hand or bad actors and personal accountability on the other. But in our exploration, we should resist repeating the same old conversations or claiming there is a silver bullet. Crime, like any behavior, is a complex function of individual traits and external realities. Economic factors, housing patterns, peer culture, school experiences, family dynamics, and health issues can all contribute to criminal behavior.

This is not meant to suggest that an individual who engages in harmful behavior should be excused because "it wasn't really their fault." We know that accountability is an essential element of criminal deterrence and justice. Rather, we suggest investigating the underlying causes of a crime at every step of its development: maintaining swift and proportionate accountability after the fact, but also considering the policies and realities-- at an individual, local, and societal level-- that shape the offender's behavior in the first place. For a long time, we have focused our efforts on responding to outcomes. Our energy and resources may be better spent on shaping them.

In the last year, the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney convened two dozen citizen focus groups, to elicit their perspectives on the root causes of crime. Participants included community elders, young people, school administrators, incarcerated and returning citizens, local leaders, Richmond's police and prosecutors, and residents in each of Richmond's "hotspots" for violent crime. This qualitative data was analyzed and presented by a team from VCU's Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory (SERL) last summer as part of a public safety discussion among City stakeholders. While the focus group analysis did not reveal an immediate formula for a safer Richmond, this work raises some important questions. We now bring that conversation to you in a series of topical sections, each followed by discussion questions.

Sincerely,

Michael N. Herring, Esq.
Commonwealth's Attorney

Iman Shabazz
Programs Specialist
Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney

Juliet Buesing, M. Ed.
University of Virginia, J.D.-M.P.P. '21

TRAUMA

Trauma is defined as a distressing or disturbing experience, often of extreme pain or deprivation. It includes exposure to violence, neglect from one's parent, abuse, ongoing family dysfunction (lack of a consistent schedule, constant arguing or drama), having one's basic needs left unmet, or even an event like divorce or death of a loved one.

In the 1990s, Robert Anda, a physician and researcher, developed the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) score, an inventory of traumatic events in childhood. Anda found that our early experiences with trauma have repercussions into our adult lives.[3] Continuing research has shown that a high ACE score is associated with significantly increased likelihood of committing crimes in the future.[4]

In our work we also meet adults who experience ongoing trauma in their homes and neighborhoods. They may feel like they are living in a "war zone," or they may struggle with hopelessness, poverty, or addiction. This trauma is not always an individual experience. Many researchers have studied the generational effects of so-called cultural trauma: a traumatic event that targets a specific community, causing "catastrophic upheaval," and "pernicious effects that persist across generations through a myriad of mechanisms from biological to behavioral."[5] Entire ethnic groups or communities can have traumatic reactions to group marginalization, historical events, exposure to severe violence, or even media coverage of national and historical events.

Most humans want some connection to others and derive a sense of importance from contributing to larger social systems like family or community. As people grow up, they form habits of behavior to meet these needs. But when these habits are shaped in an environment marked by abuse, dysfunction, neglect, or community violence, this behavior may become skewed. Instead of healthy social skills, a person may adopt harmful anti-social behavior, to protect themselves or meet their personal needs. In this context, crime is not always a function of personal choice. Sometimes crime is a manifestation of a person's effort to cope with environmental and social deficits.

Recently, policymakers in areas like education and social work have developed "trauma-informed" practices to better respond to the psychological triggers for harmful behavior.[6] Yet justice systems across the country have failed to respond, instead perpetuating archaic standards to determine guilt or innocence and sentencing. In Virginia, for example, once an individual is deemed mentally competent to stand trial, evidence of childhood or environmental trauma generally is only relevant at sentencing. Could Richmond do better, by addressing trauma earlier, in hopes of preventing criminal behavior?

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION: TRAUMA

1. How has trauma shaped the lives of our residents? Does Richmond have the resources to help heal children, families and individuals affected by trauma?

2. Are there certain connections between historic cultural trauma experienced by groups in Richmond and current criminal behavior by individuals?

3. What would trauma-sensitive policing look like? What would trauma-sensitive courts look like?

4. What is the impact of neighborhood violence on individuals? Can we reasonably expect residents not to behave violently when their neighborhoods are violent?

POVERTY

We often take for granted that communities with high concentrations of poverty will experience higher rates of crime. But why? Is the choice to offend an economic one?

Poverty can be accompanied by conditions that make crime more attractive. Families living in poverty experience the confluence of factors discussed in this paper: insufficient income, chronic unemployment or under-employment, unstable housing, poor education, and health issues derived from stress and low self-esteem. All of these lead to a stark lack of opportunity. Economists have theorized that people who see themselves with little or no opportunities might perceive the risks associated with crime as far lower than the potential benefits. Crime can offer these individuals access to goods and social power that may otherwise be out of reach. Thus crime, for someone in poverty, may be a rational economic choice.[7]

Poverty also can trap people in their early mistakes. Once an individual has a record, he or she may suffer the consequences of exclusion from housing and employment opportunities, exacerbating the cycle of offending to meet basic needs.[8] Much like an addiction, once you are involved in the criminal justice system, it can be very hard to return to living a normal life. In Virginia, an incarcerated individual has a 22% chance of being rearrested within 1 to 3 years of his release[9] -- not great odds.

But this is not the whole story. Some research has shown that the relationship between economic stress and crime isn't exactly linear. Rather, crime rates remain pretty stable as a neighborhood becomes less and less affluent. But highly concentrated poverty is a different story. Once a neighborhood crosses the "epidemic threshold" of economic stress, where poverty begins to disrupt the parenting process, neighborhood crime will rapidly increase because of the nature of teen peer relationships:

> "Once this limit is crossed, growth in the young offender population, instead of being linear, accelerates rapidly past what would have been expected if equal increments in economic stress produced equal increments in juvenile involvement in crime. [...This model...] explains why juveniles from low socioeconomic status families who reside in low socioeconomic status neighborhoods are more likely to become involved in crime than those who do not reside in such neighborhoods. Low socioeconomic status neighborhoods will generally have larger populations of delinquents and will therefore produce higher rates of interaction between juveniles susceptible to involvement in crime and juveniles already involved in crime." [10]

This data begs the question of what happens when there aren't adequate wages and childcare for families who live in areas of concentrated poverty. Have we reached the "epidemic threshold" in certain neighborhoods? Richmond has a stunning 25% poverty rate: one in four residents is experiencing "severe economic distress." Many of these individuals are concentrated into certain neighborhoods in the city. And overwhelmingly, these residents have children: at least 40% of Richmond's children are growing up in poverty-- making them susceptible to the very forces mentioned above.[11] In fact, according to a 2017 Robins Foundation report, childcare is the "single most pressing need" for struggling families.[12]

Ultimately, if we want to address crime from its origins, we should look at how we are ensuring our residents' abilities to meet their economic needs, especially residents with children.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION: POVERTY

1. Do Richmond's public assistance programs improve the lives of recipients, or do they primarily lead to intergenerational poverty and dependence? Either way, how so?

2. Is Richmond's government responsible for lifting people out of poverty? If so, what is the capacity of different levels of government and agencies to have an impact on poverty?

3. Will the city's current anti-poverty strategies help reduce crime-related factors in people's lives? Alternatively, does 'forcing' individuals into the job market by ending public assistance reduce crime?

4. Are there sufficient jobs with adequate wages in Richmond? Do residents have the skills and support they need to maintain stable employment?

5. Are economically stressed parents provided the support they need to supervise their children and raise them to live healthy lives?

HEALTH

Perhaps more pertinent and less-discussed than any other factor, health issues haunt our criminal courtrooms and jails. Overwhelmingly, individuals who live in substandard housing and suffer the chronic stress of poverty see significant health consequences, like hypertension and heart disease.[13] [14] In addition, the poor and working class are more likely to suffer disabilities and injuries from labor-intensive jobs, or health consequences due to unreliable work opportunities.[15] Worst of all, serious physical ailments often co-occur with mental and emotional issues such as anxiety or depression, potentially exacerbating the outcomes.[16]

Health care providers share our apprehension that the people who repeatedly show up in criminal courts are the same people who access the emergency room for their healthcare needs. On one hand, those individuals who lack adequate health-care often find ways to self-medicate through drugs or alcohol, often leading to both an emergency room visit and a criminal record. But additionally, emergency rooms end up treating the victims and perpetrators of many violent crimes, ranging from simple assault to homicide. It's likely that law enforcement and emergency room staff are addressing many of the same issues in the same population.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION: HEALTH

1. Does improving a person's health reduce his or her likelihood to offend?

2. Is city government responsible for improving the health of its residents, whether through direct healthcare provision or occupational safety regulation? Do the city's current efforts work? Do they reduce crime?

3. If hospitals, social workers, and law enforcement are all working with the same population, does it matter if they coordinate or work together? Should they coordinate?

4. Is it reasonable to ask emergency healthcare providers, teachers, and police officers to handle basic social work needs or mental health problems? Are these parties trained to do so?

RACE & IDENTITY

The neighborhoods and populations most impacted by crime are poor and of color. Indeed, the demographic of Richmond courtrooms and detention facilities is decidedly brown. Though questions of crime prevention are relevant to Richmonders of all races and backgrounds, we must reflect on whether some of our current methods for maintaining public safety evolved from laws and policies geared historically toward the suppression of certain residents.

If we are intellectually honest, we cannot avoid the difficult conversation of Richmond's racial history. Richmond's existing public housing projects were built by demolishing "blighted" Black communities, often with insufficient community input or compensation, and moving them into these segregated units.[17] Discriminatory policies and practices in the following decades, such as redlining, disinvestment, and unfair labor practices, forged many of our current realities.[18] Though our modern city has become much more diverse and progressive than its past, earning the city recognition as one of the top places to live in the U.S.,[19] the legacies of those practices persist, particularly for Richmond's Black community and public housing residents.

Indeed, the numbers are alarming. Richmond's population is approximately 48% African American[20], yet according to Richmond's Police Department, in the last three years, 88% of violent offenders and 77% of violent crime victims in our city have been Black.[21] Even in gentrifying neighborhoods like Churchill North and Fulton, about 90% of victims of violent crime are still Black.[22] Why are we seeing so much crime involving Black residents?

Perhaps this phenomenon can be attributed to neighborhood demographics or correlations with poverty on trauma. Or perhaps we need to dig deeper. Does the history of slavery, Jim Crow, and segregation constitute a sort of cultural trauma internalized by our Black residents? If so, do we see this internalized trauma in some of the violence in the Black community?

But this is a conversation for Richmond's wider population as well. Do Richmond's white families see value in living in a diverse community? Do they understand the importance of their children experiencing a diversity of backgrounds in school and friendships? Or have they too internalized the historical racism of this city?

Surely Richmond's economic leaders recognize the potential of a stronger labor market if we solve these problems. Surely city leaders understand just how much money and productivity crime is costing us. Ultimately, the success of our city hinges on the success of all of us. As a city, do we truly value each other, no matter our racial background or economic reality?

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION: IDENTITY

1. In what ways do language choices by criminal justice leaders contribute to stereotypes or racialized perceptions of crime? How do these stereotypes manifest in the community?

2. Should law enforcement, courts, and prosecutors be concerned about the disparate number of minorities cycling through the criminal justice system? If the law is being applied fairly, is this still a problem?

3. Do we over-police poor communities and communities of color? Does the level of policing in these communities increase public safety or simply yield more arrests?

4. How can people living in areas of concentrated crime hold local officials as well as other residents accountable for improving culture and safety? Are there political barriers to a city-wide crime reduction strategy?

HOUSING

Deeply intertwined with the issues of poverty and identity is that of housing. Families living around blight and highly concentrated poverty also suffer negative housing effects, which can include: poorly maintained buildings,[23] noise pollution,[24] poor air quality,[25] inadequate heating and cooling,[26] lack of access to nutritious food,[27] incomplete kitchens,[28] and high eviction rates.[29]

For families trapped in poverty, the effects of these factors are severe, and ultimately, may contribute to crime. Housing conditions impact self-esteem, family development, and social networks. Where you live and how you get around can greatly affect your exposure to illicit activity, your access to educational opportunity, and your perceptions of personal culture and identity.

Public housing policy especially calls for re-examination. In the last three years, though less than 5% of the city's population officially live in the six remaining public housing projects, 15% of Richmond's violent crime occurred in those areas.[30] This concentrates our most vulnerable residents in the some of the most dangerous and stressful places to live. We are especially concerned about the young men whose pride seems to hang on defending and avenging these "street" or neighborhood identities, instead of on building strong family or school connections.

Twenty years ago, Richmond decided to disband one of its most dangerous housing projects, Blackwell, followed by Dove Court ten years later.[31] We acknowledge the difficulty of such decisions for the communities impacted, but we believe many of the families were moved into mixed-income neighborhoods, presumably where they had better access to social mobility. Concentrated area crime fell, and those neighborhoods in subsequent years have flourished and developed. Is mixed-income housing the answer? Or did we simply displace the poverty and crime to an area where we can't see it?

We argue that a conversation about crime prevention in Richmond cannot truly happen absent a discussion of housing conditions and public housing policies.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION: HOUSING

1. How can city agencies and other stakeholders integrate public safety into their approaches to housing and economic development? Should law enforcement have a voice in these city planning choices?

2. Are public housing facility rules and RRHA policies beneficial for residents? Are there ways that Richmond's housing policies lead to or perpetuate criminal activity?

3. What are the costs and benefits of disbanding public housing? Should our public housing policy prioritize transitioning away from areas of high concentrations of poverty and toward mixed-income solutions?

EDUCATION
& YOUTH PROGRAMS

It is often said that crime is a "young man's game." The data backs this up: the vast majority of crimes in Virginia are committed by men under 35. In fact, almost a third of Virginia's violent crimes last year were perpetrated by school-aged teens, aged 10-17.[32]

Richmond Public Schools students are encouraged to achieve academic success and develop well-rounded social behavior. Yet they often bring into the classroom the socio-economic factors and traumatic experiences mentioned in this paper, sometimes with violent or other behavioral consequences. Or they avoid the classroom entirely, choosing truancy over attendance.[33] Candid conversations with RPS teachers and administrators reveal that there are simply insufficient resources to truly serve our students' many needs. Teacher turnover is high,[34] and classroom behavioral management demands attention and energy that should be devoted to instruction. In response, many parents either relocate to neighboring counties or enroll their children in private schools.[35]

We are getting dangerously close to a city of non-parallel tracks: one for students who are fortunate enough to enroll in adequately resourced schools with low teacher turnover and normal behavioral needs; and another where the students must navigate environmental trauma in their neighborhoods and behavioral distractions during the school day. Should we reasonably expect similar outcomes between students on the different tracks?

But it's not just the school day that matters. Before children reach school-age, they must develop communication skills, emotional security, and problem-solving abilities.[36] These first five years are in many ways the most important, yet our most economically and environmentally stressed parents—often low-income single mothers[37]—must juggle jobs, living expenses, housing, and childcare. While Virginia does have an established Pre-K program for low-income youth (VPK and Headstart), RPS's persistent bus shortage means that our youngest and neediest kids are often on their own for getting there, which hurts enrollment, attendance, and access.[38]

For middle schoolers and teenagers, the after-school window has proven to be particularly troublesome. Little League used to have a strong presence in Richmond, giving young people a constructive outlet for their energy. But in recent years, it appears to have declined. The Department of Parks and Recreation and various local organizations provide some programming, but we wonder if we are doing enough to give our youth productive outlets for their energy and time. Are we encouraging a culture of engagement and commitment in our youth, so they learn the value of practice and team work, build creative problem solving skills, and develop new interests? At a minimum, we wonder whether a dollar spent on after-school activities yields a greater return than a dollar spent on traditional law enforcement.

Through some of our interactions with students we have learned many are not college bound. They express interest in skilled trades but are frustrated by a lack of substantive, non-stigmatized vocational programming. They want more guidance on future career options. Are we providing such programs for our kids and teens? Do our students have access to entry-level jobs and strong mentors?

We cannot fully address crime without a conversation about how we are providing for the educational and social needs of our young people.

SOCIAL MEDIA & CULTURE

Prior to the early 2000's, information about neighborhood crime often remained out of sight and out of mind-- except when local news outlets covered a story. However, in the age of social media, we are exposed to crime at an accelerated rate. Perpetrators use social media to announce their pre-crime intentions and boast about their completed acts. Young men pose with weapons online to garner attention and project their "street" identities. Even more heartbreaking, they often strike these poses with young children in the foreground. We worry that social media is impacting our communities' ability to reinforce strong and safe values in youth.

Technology also seems to exacerbate crime in a way that has yet to be studied. Gone are the days when it took days or weeks for inflammatory remarks to reach a rival in another neighborhood. Instead, the response time is instantaneous. Disputes remain active, carried on via text message, snapchat, or other platforms, and often in public (at least virtually). Inevitably text messages and social media posts make their way into courtroom evidence, showing that something is changing in these disputes. We want to know more about crime in the age of technology, and whether we need to respond with new tactics.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Lastly, we must reflect on our methods of policing neighborhoods and prosecuting offenders. Police shoulder the burden of our city's many problems when they respond to calls for service. Armed with little or no data on the background of the involved parties, police are expected to take some action to improve the situation and eliminate threats. To further complicate matters, when they respond to calls for violent crime, they often encounter residents who refuse to assist with the investigations.

It's tempting to question whether we should allocate our police resources to communities that refuse to support our investigations. The logic follows that as long as the crime doesn't spill out of those neighborhoods, then the residents that refuse to help can't expect improvement. A more constructive way to frame the issue may be whether there are actions officers aren't taking that could break down these barriers and rebuild trust.

The overlap of crime with so many social concerns raises the question of whose job intervention should be. Often, the families that call for police services are the same families that need intervention for child services, mental health, or housing assistance. Is there a better way for agencies to work together and lift these families to stability?

Over the last twenty years, policing has gone through many transformations. Should police officers be "tough on crime" and target even minor offenses to make a community safer? Should prosecutors push for harsh sentences and as many convictions or guilty pleas possible? Advocates argue that stiff sentencing seems to improve public safety. But critics respond that the long-term effects of high rates of arrest and conviction damages families and communities, causing more harm than they prevent. Perhaps treatment, intervention, and alternate programs that reduce convictions and rehabilitate offenders would be a better approach. These programs are expensive, but nothing is as expensive as incarceration.

Ultimately, Richmonders must make some important decisions about how we spend our tax dollars, based on the returns on our investment. We must consider the interests of the victim, who deserves our utmost care and protection, the rehabilitation and reintegration of the offender, and our shared goals about public safety.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION: LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. Considering how much money Richmond has spent on crime reduction, why has there not been more improvement? Are our current priorities the best investment?

2. Is the criminal enforcement of substance abuse a productive strategy? How should we police or enforce low-level or nuisance offenses?

3. Is the quality of service received by people living in areas of highly concentrated crime and poverty equal to that of other neighborhoods?

4. What policing behaviors and strategies could help redevelop community trust in law enforcement?

CONCLUSION

We acknowledge that our search may pose more questions than answers at this stage. Crime is a complex social problem with many layers to uncover. But Richmond must move beyond the traditional methods of addressing crime reactively, solely through policing and prosecution.

Cities all over the world are modernizing their public safety programs and bringing together stakeholders on interconnected issues like crime. In Glasgow, the police force has developed a public-health informed *Violence Reduction Unit* that treats violent crime as an epidemic using contagion-prevention practices. In Chicago and New York, local non-profits like *Cure Violence* work to prevent crime on the ground with intervention specialists who know their communities. And in Cincinnati, *StriveTogether* is bringing together city departments, local nonprofits, and schools to work on a concerted effort to holistically improve children's outcomes.

It's time for Richmond to also start thinking bigger. To start, we must address the traumatic roots of crime; the health, economic, and identity needs of our residents; the concentrated poverty impacting our housing and schools; the legacy of historically racist policies on our modern streets; and the damaged relationship between law enforcement and communities.

We hope that collectively addressing the questions we've raised will provide context for a broader discussion among all of us on public safety-- from the city's decision-makers to the community members most affected-- and provoke a dialogue that can lead to the development of long-term strategies for building a truly safer Richmond.

CITATIONS & ENDNOTES

1. Data from the Richmond Police Department.

2. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, homicides were much higher than today. The peak homicide rate, in 1994, was 161. In 2018, there were 56 homicides. Property crimes rose last year in the following sectors: 111 by 27%, 112 by 8%, 113 by 15%; 211 by 28%, 213 by 7% and 311 by 5%. All data from the Richmond Police Department.

3. Paul Tough's *How Children Succeed* (Mariner Books, 2012), recounts the Anda study in great detail.

4. Numerous studies by psychologists, economists, physicians, and justice system experts have elaborated on the association between childhood trauma or neglect and adult crime-- increasing the likelihood of a future offense by around 30-60%. For a small sampling of research see:
- Reavis, J. "Adverse Childhood Experiences and Adult Criminality: How Long Must We Live Before We Possess Our Own Lives?" Originally Published in *The Permanente Journal* (Spring 2013).
- Bartos, L. "Pipeline to Prison May Start with Childhood Trauma." *California Health Report* (January 2016).

5. Quoted from the abstract of Walters, K., et al. "Bodies Don't Just Tell Stories, They Tell Histories: Embodiment of Historical Trauma among American Indians and Alaska Natives." Cambridge Univ. Press, *Du Bois Review*, Vol. 8, Issue 1 (April 2011).

6. For more on trauma-informed practices in education, see *The Trauma Sensitive Classroom* (W. W. Norton, 2018) by Patricia Jennings.

7. See *Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach* (National Bureau of Economic Research, 1974) and related work by Gary S. Becker, a Nobel prize winning economist.

8. *The Sentencing Project* has elaborated on the ways mass incarceration and a criminal record can damage an individual's future long after the sentence has been served. See "Poverty and Opportunity Profile: Americans with Criminal Records" (2015).

9. It is worth noting that 22% is currently the best rate in the nation. Data from: Virginia Department of Corrections. "State Recidivism Comparison: 2017."

10. Based on the work of Don Weatherburn and Bronwyn Lind. Quoted from "Poverty, Parenting, Peers, and Crime-Prone Neighborhoods." *The Australian Institute of Criminology:* Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice (April 1998).

11. Data on Richmond's poverty rate comes from the Richmond Office of Community Wealth Building, Annual Report (February 2018).

12. The Robins Foundation. "Portrait of Vulnerable Families and Community Needs in Richmond's Northside." prepared by Communitas Consulting (Oct. 2017).

13. Ezzati, M. et al. "Worldwide trends in blood pressure from 1975-2015: a pooled analysis of 1479 population-based measurement studies with 19.1 million participants." *The Lancet.* Volume 389, Issue 10064 (January 2017).

14. Rattue, P. "Lower Income Individuals have a 50% Higher Risk of Heart Disease." *Medical News Today.* (August 2011).

15. Burgard, S. and Lin, K. "Bad Jobs, Bad Health? How Work and Working Conditions Contribute to Health Disparities." Originally published in *American Behavioral Science* (August 2013).

16. Jones, D. et al. "Prevalence, Severity, and co-occurrence of Chronic Physical Health Problems of Persons with Serious Mental Illness." Psychiatry Online (2004). See also: Robson, D. "Serious Mental Illness and Physical Health Problems: a discussion paper." International Journal of Nursing Studies. Vol 44, Is, 3 (March 2007).

17. Germer, L. "A Public History of Public Housing: Richmond, Virginia." Yale National Initiative to Strengthen Teaching in Public Schools (2017).

18. *Id.*

19. See U.S. News and World Report, "Top 25 U.S. Cities to Live, 2017."

20. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau: Richmond City, Quick Facts (as of January 2019).

21. 2016-2018 neighborhood crime data from the Richmond Police Department. Here, violent crime includes all violent bodily crimes except robberies.

22. *Id.* Note that 92.65% of victims in CHN and 84.54% of victims in FLTN were African American.

23. For more on the conditions of housing-insecure families, see: Desmond, M. *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City.* Crown Publishers (2016).

24. Casey, J. et al. "Race/Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status, Residential Segregation, and Spatial Variation in Noise Exposure in the Contiguous United States." *Environmental Health Perspectives.* (July 2017).

25. Morello-Frosch, R. "End Double Jeopardy: New principles can stop us from dumping on minorities and the poor." *Scientific American.* (June 2009).

26. In 2011, the Richmond-Times Dispatch wrote that "tens of thousands of Virginians" struggle to pay their heating bills each year. See Bacque, P. "Help is available to Pay Heating Bills." *Richmond-Times Dispatch* (December 2011).

27. In 2013, the Richmond Virginia Food Policy Task Force found that approximately 40% of Richmonders live in a so-called "food desert," where grocery stores are not walkable, and fast food or convenience stores are more likely sources of food. An even higher percentage of children is affected. Data from the Mayor's Healthy Richmond Campaign, "Report and Recommendations to Improve Food Access in the City" (July 2013).

28. *Id.* In certain high-poverty areas of Richmond's East End, between 9-31% of households lack a working stove, sink, or refrigerator.

29. Richmond has the second highest eviction filing rate in the country, at 11.4% (*The Eviction Lab:* https://evictionlab.org/). The lead researcher, Matthew Desmond, has found that if a neighborhood's eviction rate increases, its violent crime rate increases the following year [See endnote 23 above].

30. Data from the Richmond Police Department. Population of the public housing projects estimated by multiplying the number of units by an average of 3 residents per unit. Richmond population data from the U.S. Census Bureau, above.

31. Dates from Richmond City.

32. In 2017, Approximately 27% of violent crime offenders were boys 17 or younger. 2.5% were girls 17 or younger. Another 39% were men aged 18-35. Data from the Department of State Police, *Virginia Uniform Crime Reporting Program.* Crime in Virginia: 2017. (January 2018).

33. Between 2013 and 2017, an incredible 38% of Richmond's traditional high school students were chronically absent, missing more than 10% of the school year. Richmond truancy data is available online at the Virginia Department of Education: School Quality Profiles.

34. Richmond's teacher turnover is between 16-20% each year, a very high rate. See Mattingly, J. "Richmond schools still have about 50 teacher vacancies..." *Richmond Times-Dispatch.* (October 2017).

35. Germer, L. [see endnote 17 above] estimates that about 30% of Richmond city's school-aged children attend private schools.

36. The first five years have been written about extensively by early childhood education specialists. For a quick overview, visit "Why It Matters" at *The First Five Years Fund* online (www.ffyf.org).

37. 69% of children in Richmond are growing up in single-parent households, more than double the national average (33%). Data from the Food Policy Task Force Report (2013). [See endnote 27 above]

38. Brown, S. "How Richmond Public schools are dealing with school bus driver shortage." *CBS 6 News.* (October 2018).

39. Based on an analysis of the 2016-2018 School-Based Juvenile Intake Complaints data, provided by the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice (January 2019).