UNDERSTANDING SERIOUS VIOLENCE AND IDENTIFYING HIGHEST RISK POPULATIONS

For The Council on Criminal Justice Violent Crime Working Group
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1. Our mission is to help cities use evidence based strategies to advance a "triple bottom line" – reduce serious violence (shootings); reduce the use of arrest and build community-police trust.

1. We have learned that we have to change the way cities work for violence reduction efforts to be effective and sustainable.

1. So, we help cities develop relevant capacities:
   a. Analysis of risk of violence (problem definition)
   b. Developing and managing violence reduction strategies
   c. Principled policing for violence reduction
   d. Effective outreach and intervention for highest risk populations
   e. Police-community trust building
   f. Performance management
   g. Learning and impact evaluations of local efforts.
“Violence prevention efforts should consider the social dynamics of gun violence:

Tracing the spread of violence episodes through social networks could provide valuable information for public health and medical professionals, in addition to law enforcement, looking to intervene with the people and communities at highest risk.”

From: Ben Green, MSc; Thibaut Horel, MSc; Andrew V. Papachristos, PhD, Modeling Contagion Through Social Networks to Explain and Predict Gunshot Violence in Chicago, 2006 to 2014. Journal of the American Medical Association.
Analyzing Local Violence Problems and Risk of Violence
Problem Analysis: Introduction and Overview

• The actual dynamics of violence often differ from conventional wisdom and the narratives of policy makers, community members and agency leaders.

• A “problem analysis” establishes a fact-based, common understanding of the local violence problem that informs the work of civic, community, and criminal justice leaders to reduce violence.

• The problem analysis identifies the networks and individuals within a community who are at greatest risk of violence and helps tailor an intervention to reduce that risk.

• Though the methodology is informed by research, the problem analysis is primarily a practice document with implications for local policy.
Problem Analysis: Introduction and Overview (2)

A problem analysis generally includes the following activities:

1. Reviewing a large number of homicides (two years worth; sometimes more) as well as a sizable sample of non-fatal shootings to understand the context, motives and connections between incidents. (The WHO and WHY)

2. Coding and analyzing the demographics and criminal justice histories of the victims and suspects in those incidents. (The WHO)

3. Mapping the social networks of those involved in violence and the relationships between high risk groups, networks, serious violence and high-crime areas. (The WHO and WHERE)

4. Mapping and analyzing the concentration of serious violence citywide and in particularly violent places. (The WHERE)

- It is usually developed with police department intelligence and formal data, but reviewed and revised with input from street intervention organizations.
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Murder Rate per 100,000: Oakland v. California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homicides & Firearm Assaults*: 2016

[Map showing areas with high incidence of homicides and firearm assaults]
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Oakland’s Failed Attempts to Reduce Violence

Oakland had previously made numerous attempts to reduce this chronic violence problem

- Youth Curfew
- Gang Injunction
- Large service and outreach investments (Measure Y, private investments)
- Numerous waves of aggressive, “zero tolerance” area-based enforcement

Take Away: These efforts were not informed by a thorough analysis/understanding of the problem; were poorly managed; did not constitute an effective citywide strategy.
What the public and policy makers thought: Violence primarily driven by juveniles, drugs disputes and economic motives.

What the analysis revealed:

- Homicide primarily driven by specific running group/gang conflicts and personal disputes between group members.
- Those at very highest risk primarily group-involved adult men of color (the average age is 30)
- With heavy justice system involvement (averaging 11 prior arrests at the time of homicide, 7 for felonies) and social connections to actively violent street groups
- Only 10% of homicide involved juveniles, only 13% of homicides had any connection to drugs.
## Criminal Histories of Victims and Suspects, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Suspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known to the CJ system prior to the incident</td>
<td>69.84%</td>
<td>90.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of those known to the CJ system</strong></td>
<td>N = 88</td>
<td>N = 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>28.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of prior arrests</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of felony arrests</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior probation</td>
<td>79.55%</td>
<td>76.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active probation at time of incident</td>
<td>19.32%</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior parole</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Incarceration</td>
<td>84.10%</td>
<td>82.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted of Felony</td>
<td>73.86%</td>
<td>72.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central and East Oakland Groups, Primarily Black 2012-2013

Associations change frequently

Legend:
- **Red arrow** = predictable conflict
- **Green arrow** = predictable alliance
- **Dashed green arrow** = unpredictable alliance
Group Member Involved Homicides, Citywide, Groups with 3 or More Incidents, Jan 2012 – June 2013
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San Francisco
San Francisco Homicide Rate (per 100,000 population): 1995 - 2018

San Francisco Homicide Rate (per 100,000 population): 1995 - 2018
Two distinct but overlapping dynamics drive serious violence in San Francisco:

• **Group Dynamics**: A majority of gun homicides (53%-70%) and non-fatal shootings (50-77%) are driven by or connected to street group dynamics.

• **Street Disorder**: A significant minority of homicides and non-fatal shootings are driven by interconnected street homeless / mental illness (19%) and drug market dynamics (18%), primarily in the Tenderloin area.

• These two dynamics require somewhat different approaches and involve different sets of stakeholders.
All Homicides & Shootings: Jan 2017 – June 2020
Age:

All Known Individuals Involved in Homicides \( (n = 327) \)
January 2017 – June 2020
Age:
All Known Individuals Involved in Shootings \( (n = 141) \)
January 2019 – December 2019

Victims | Suspects
--- | ---
17 and under | 3.9% | 0.0%
18-24 | 34.6% | 54.1%
25-34 | 39.4% | 32.4%
35-44 | 9.6% | 10.8%
45 and older | 2.5% | 2.7%
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### Victims and Suspects of Homicides & Shootings: Sex and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homicides</th>
<th></th>
<th>Shootings</th>
<th></th>
<th>San Francisco Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims (n=165)</td>
<td>Suspects (n=164)</td>
<td>Victims &amp; Suspects (n=329)</td>
<td>Victims (n=104)</td>
<td>Suspects (n=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Homicide Victims and Suspects: Criminal Justice System Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims (n=161)*</th>
<th>Suspects (n=160)*</th>
<th>Victims &amp; Suspects (n=321)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known to the CJ system prior to the incident</td>
<td>102 (63.4%)</td>
<td>124 (77.5%)</td>
<td>226 (70.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those known to the CJ System:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of prior arrests</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of prior felony arrests</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior probation/post-prison supervision</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active probation/post-prison supervision</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarceration</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted of felony</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criminal histories from 4 victims and 4 suspects not included due missing information.
Fatal & Non-Fatal Shootings Overview

2019 GUN VIOLENCE
N=110

- 25.5% Resulted from ongoing group conflicts
- 21.8% Resulted from personal disputes
- 45-77% Involve group/gang members as victims or suspects

Race of Victims & Suspects
- Black: 59.6%
- Hispanic: 29.3%
- White: 6.9%
- Other: 1.6%

Age of Victims & Suspects
- 18-24: 36.7%
- 25-34: 37.2%
- 35-44: 12.2%
- 45 & older: 10.6%

www.theCApartnership.org
Group Conflicts and Alliances

GROUPS AND GANGS IN SAN FRANCISCO
Ingleside, Bayview, Northern & Park Districts
JULY 2020

<Diagram showing network of group conflicts and alliances>
Groups Involved in Three or More Homicides

Bayview Side A: Groups K, N, Q, X, and AH
Bayview Side B: Groups W, AF, and AA

- Group BA: 1 victim, 10 suspects, 1 both
- Bayview Side B: 1 victim, 6 suspects, 1 both
- Bayview Side A: 2 victims, 5 suspects, 3 both
- Group BB: 1 victim, 5 suspects, 3 both
- Group AD: 4 suspects
- Group J: 1 victim, 2 suspects

*Includes only seven groups found to be most prevalent within each of the included quarters.*
All Homicides & Shootings: Jan 2017 – June 2020
Group-Involved Homicides
Drug-Related Shootings/Homicides
All Violence: Tenderloin Area Concentration by Circumstance

[Map of Tenderloin Area with various colored dots indicating different types of violence against the backdrop of street names like Bush St, Sutter St, and O'Farrell St.]

- Red dots: Personal dispute
- Green dots: Drug related
- Purple dots: Domestic violence
- Yellow dots: Robbery
- Blue dots: Group related
- Black dots: Instant dispute
- White dots: Other

www.theCApartnership.org
1. **Group dynamics tend to drive gun violence**: A small number of high risk social networks (groups) are often involved in the majority of gun violence in any given city (in our experience).

1. **Those at the highest risk of gun violence** tend to be primarily 18-35, men of color with extensive justice system histories (10-15 prior arrests); and social connections to high risk groups and conflicts.

   - Reducing retaliation shootings requires sustained focus within police departments and intervention organizations on this violence dynamic.
   - The findings have implications for a range of other justice system and community actors.
   - Cities would generally benefit from a greater intervention focus and investment in this population.
DISCUSSION: