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Criminal Justice and Health and Human Services
An Exploration of Overlapping Needs, Resources, and Interests in Brooklyn Neighborhoods

Data Sources

The New York City Dept. of Info. Technology and Training (2000 data)
The New York City Dept. of City Planning (2000 data)
The United States Census 2000 (2000 data)
The New York City Human Resources Administration (2000 data)
The New York City Police Department (2000 data)
The New York City Dept. of Corrections (1998 data)
The New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (1998 data)
The New York City Dept. of Probation (1999 data)
The New York State Division of Parole (2000 data)
Traditionally, criminal justice and other public policy analysis takes place on either a case-by-case basis or on the broad jurisdictional level. However, both these analytical ends of the spectrum miss the cumulative impact that individual decisions have on neighborhoods. To register that important dimension, data must be mapped at the census tract or block level.
Population Profile
Brooklyn, NY

Single Parent Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 to 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Population Under 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s difficult to understand the impact of needs based programs or criminal justice services without taking account of important demographic concentrations, such as single parent households and youth.
Population Profile
Brooklyn, NY

It’s also important to note of other demographic concentrations, such as race and ethnicity.
Needs Based Programs
Brooklyn, NY

Percent on TANF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 25</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Lightest</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None 0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipients of needs based program services reside in particular neighborhoods in concentration. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) recipients tend to cluster in the same places as single parent households and children receiving Public Assistance tend to cluster around places with high concentrations of youth.
Although they are not evenly distributed across neighborhoods, recipients of Foodstamps and Medicaid are much more widely disbursed than are recipients of TANF and children on Public Assistance.
It is vitally important to understand incarceration, re-integration, and community supervision as a backdrop to the provision of needs based program services. Residents who are admitted to jail and prison are highly concentrated in a few neighborhoods. The highest incarceration rate neighborhoods experience nine times as many admissions to jail and prison each year than the lowest. Moreover, their incarceration and return takes place over a relatively short period of time—66% of incarcerated residents return home in fewer than 3 years, producing a potentially destabilizing migration pattern in these neighborhoods.
Neighborhood incarceration rates are different than the more traditionally mapped crime rates. Crime patterns differ according to type of crime. For example, property crime tends to take place in neighborhoods that are better off and do not themselves experience high incarceration rates. Moreover, overall crime rates are more evenly distributed across neighborhoods than are incarceration rates. The highest crime rate precinct is only about three times higher than the lowest.
Another way to understand criminal justice policy as a backdrop to the provision of needs based program services is to specify the deployment of resources geographically. For example, the individual, case-by-case decisions to remove and return residents to and from incarceration add up to considerable expenditures for the well being of particular neighborhoods. In some neighborhoods, we find “million dollar blocks,” in which more than a million dollars are spent to incarcerate and return residents from that block in a single year. Cumulatively, upwards of $50 million dollars are spent each year to remove and return residents from the highest incarceration rate neighborhoods. One reason it is important to take account of the deployment of resources for any particular geographical location is that when added up across services—e.g., criminal justice, health & human services, labor, etc...—opportunities to blend resources in more effective service combinations become apparent.
Concentrations of residents under the supervision of probation and parole authorities mirror those of incarceration. Thousands of residents are under the supervision of separate criminal justice agencies in a single neighborhood. These overlaps also present opportunities for cross criminal justice agency collaborations when viewed from a community-level perspective.
As with incarceration expenditures, the deployment of probation and parole supervision resources is important to understand geographically. For example, the map of Brooklyn below (left) shows the residence of one probation officer’s caseload. That officer supervises what are deemed “high risk” probationers. The officer’s caseload is 76 probationers. If we focus in on just one police precinct highlighted below (left) and map all the probationers on “high risk” supervision, we find that in that single police precinct there are 218 “high risk” probationers (bottom right). If we ask the question: How many different probation officers are these 218 probationers assigned to? We find that they fall into the caseloads of 43 different officers. This despite the fact that 218 probationers constitute only three caseloads.

The obvious opportunity made evident by this geographical caseload analysis is that all the “high risk” probationers in this precinct could be assigned to three instead of 43 different officers. Moreover, if they worked in the precinct instead of the downtown office, they would have a substantially greater understanding of the neighborhood in which their caseloads resided.
Criminal Justice and Needs Based Program Populations

Incarcerated Residents (1 Yr)

TANF Recipients

When we directly compare the rates of incarcerated residents and residents receiving TANF (expressed below in terms of standard deviations from the mean), we see substantial overlap in the highest concentration neighborhoods. These geographical overlaps suggest that these may be coincident populations.
Criminal Justice and Needs Based Program Populations

Brooklyn, NY

Incarcerated Parents (1 Yr)

When we further specify populations such as incarcerated parents and children receiving Public Assistance, the overlap in neighborhood concentrations is even more acute. They suggest the opportunity for economy of scale collaborations between criminal justice and health and human services.

Children Under 18 on PA

Mean = 115

-1 – 0 Std. Dev.

0 – 1 Std. Dev.

1 – 2 Std. Dev.

2 – 3 Std. Dev.

> 3 Std. Dev.
A bird’s eye view of a high incarceration community shows dramatically how incarceration is a factor on almost every block of this community. It further suggests that involvement in the criminal justice system provides an irrepressible backdrop to the provision of needs based services. Issues such as incarceration and reintegration are further amplified by drug addiction and mental illness.

**Incarcerated Residents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Blocks</th>
<th>Incarcerated Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 - 250</td>
<td>31 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 30</td>
<td>6 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Incarcerated**
4,334 (4% of Adults)

**Drug Addicted**
3,207 (3% of Adults)

**Mentally Ill**
693 (1% of Adults)
Lending even more weight to the suggestion that needs based program recipients and criminal justice populations are highly overlapping in particular places, even in the small area of these two census tracts, there are substantial coincident populations.