Spatiotemporal Analysis of the Impact of Homeless Encampment Sweeps on Crime in Denver, CO, 2019-2023



¹University of Colorado School of Medicine, Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine Funding: National Institute on Drug Abuse (DP2DA051864)

Background

- >580,000 people experience homelessness nightly in the US
- Many cities have "camping bans" to address unsheltered homelessness
- Denver's camping ban went into effect on May 28, 2012
- Bans are enforced by "sweeps" of encampments
- Sweeps cited as necessary for "public health and safety"
- Limited evidence that sweeps are effective in reducing crime

Objective

To assess the spatiotemporal relationship between homeless encampment sweeps and area crime.

Methods

DATA SOURCES

- Crime data from Denver police
 - 196/day on average
 - Attributes: date/time, location, category (n=13)
- Sweep data from city of Denver
 - n=303
 - Attributes: date, location

STUDY DESIGN

- Pre-post ecological study
- Knox test statistic (κ) to detect excess spatiotemporal clustering
- 4 catchment areas: 0.25 mi, 0.5 mi, 0.75 mi, citywide
- 3 time periods: 7, 14, 21 days
- 95% confidence interval (95% CI) created via bootstrapping

OUTCOMES

- Primary
 - 1 Δ crimes: change in crime (crimes_{post} crimes_{pre})
- Secondary
 - 2 crimes_{pre}: average number of crimes before sweeps
 - 3 crimes_{post}: average number of crimes after sweeps



Citywide, encampment "sweeps" are not associated with decreases in crime

FINDING 1: CRIME DOES NOT GENERALLY I



• No change beyond 0.25 miles

FINDING 2: CRIME IS GENERALLY HIGH IN PERIODS BEFORE A SWEEP



FINDING 3: CRIME GENERALLY REMAINS HIGH AFTER A SWEEP



Pranav Padmanabhan, BS¹, Samantha K. Nall, MPH¹, Cole Jurecka, MPH¹, Joshua A. Barocas, MD¹

School of Medicine UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO NSCHUTZ MEDICAL CAMPUS

Results

| DECR | EASE AF | TER A | SWEEP |
|--------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| | Observed difference | Expected null (95% CI) | p-value |
| | <mark>-1.31</mark> | (-0.54, 0.68) | <.001 |
| | <mark>-1.54</mark> | (-0.74, 1.15) | <.001 |
| ficant | <mark>-1.56</mark> | (-0.81, 1.87) | .002 |
| | <mark>-1.62</mark> | (-1.15, 1.33) | .007 |
| | 0.05 | (-1.07, 3.21) | .35 |
| | 0.53 | (-0.92, 4.99) | .32 |
| | -0.13 | (-1.28, 2.05) | .54 |
| | 2.89 | (-0.69, 5.38) | .72 |
| | 2.11 | (0.27, 8.00) | .30 |
| | | | |

| | Observed # of crimes | Expected null (95% CI) | p-value | |
|----------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------|--|
| | <mark>14.1</mark> | (12.4, 13.4) | <.001 | |
| | <mark>27.7</mark> | (24.8, 26.6) | <.001 | |
| lificant | <mark>40.5</mark> | (36.9, 39.1) | <.001 | |
| | <mark>54.8</mark> | (51.5, 53.7) | <.001 | |
| | <mark>107.9</mark> | (102.4, 106.0) | <.001 | |
| | <mark>159.5</mark> | (152.1, 157.1) | <.001 | |
| | <mark>110.9</mark> | (107.7, 110.7) | .02 | |
| | 219.0 | (213.9, 219.3) | .08 | |
| ⊢• | <mark>325.9</mark> | (317.7, 324.4) | .004 | |
|) | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | Observed # of crimes | Expected null (95% CI) | p-value | |
|----------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------|--|
| | 12.8 | (12.5, 13.5) | .37 | |
| hificant | 26.1 | (25.0, 26.9) | .65 | |
| | 38.9 | (37.3, 39.8) | .53 | |
| | 53.2 | (51.6, 53.7) | .37 | |
| | <mark>108.0</mark> | (103.2, 107.4) | .01 | |
| | <mark>160.1</mark> | (153.8, 159.4) | .01 | |
| | 110.8 | (108.0, 111.1) | .14 | |
| | <mark>221.9</mark> | (216.1, 221.8) | .04 | |
| H | 328.0 | (321.1, 329.3) | .18 | |
|) | | | | |

| Change in crime after sweeps, citywide | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---------|--|
| | Change in crimes (Δcrimes) per sweep | Expected change per sweep (95% CI) | p-value | |
| 7 days | -5.32 | (-9.97, 11.42) | .27 | |
| 14 days | 3.44 | (-13.27, 27.09) | .74 | |
| 21 days | 10.32 | (-4.04, 40.61) | .49 | |

Change in crime after sweeps, by crime category



*Result reported if significance holds at 2/3 time periods within a certain dist

- Hyperlocal decrease in crime primarily driven by auto theft and public disorder
- Significant increase in murder and other crimes against persons (primarily simple assault and domestic violence) at certain distance and time combinations

Conclusion

- Sweeps are **reactive to crime**; they occur when crime is spiking locally
- Sweeps do not prevent crime; spatiotemporal clustering of crime remains higher than expected near swept areas in postsweep periods
 - Sweeps are not an effective solution for crime
 - Hyperlocal decreases in crime after sweeps are temporary
 - Decreases are driven by less serious crimes, while more serious types of crimes increase
 - Some crime is diffused outward rather than curtailed outright
 - Sweeps exacerbate cycles of violence against people experiencing homelessness, increasing their risk of overdose, injury, and victimization