

Report on

**Evaluation of Virginia's Weed and
Seed Initiative**

To the Chairs of the
Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
Criminal Justice Research Center

October 2000

Evaluation of Virginia's Weed and Seed Initiative

Project Staff

Department of Criminal Justice Services
Criminal Justice Research Center

Sherri Johnson
Evaluation Specialist

Trina Bogle Willard
Evaluation Unit Chief

Donna Walko-Frankovic
Evaluation Specialist

Alison Houston
Criminal Justice Program Analyst

Department of Criminal Justice Services
Joseph B. Benedetti, Director

To request additional copies of this report, please contact:
Criminal Justice Research Center
Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 371-0530

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. REPORT AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE.....	2
III. PROGRAM BACKGROUND	3
The National Weed and Seed Program.....	3
Description of the Virginia Initiative	4
Differences Between Virginia and Federal Requirements	6
IV. ADMINISTRATIVE OVERVIEW	6
V. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	8
Data Source.....	9
Limitations on Use of Target Area Crime Statistics.....	10
VI. REVIEW OF LOCAL PROGRAMS	11
Lynchburg	11
Norfolk	19
Petersburg.....	26
Winchester	31
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	38
Discussion of Program Findings	38
Recommendations	40
VIII. SUMMARY.....	45
IX. REFERENCES	46
X. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	47

Appendix A: Report Authority from Item 449 of the 1998 Budget Bill

Appendix B: Evaluation Reporting Forms

Appendix C: Reported IBR Offenses and Arrests in Weed and Seed Target Areas

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From July 1997 through June 2000, state grant funds were provided for three years through the Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative to focus state and local resources on reducing crime and improving the quality of life in selected localities. Weed and Seed funds supported intensive law enforcement efforts in high-crime neighborhoods to “weed out” crime, which were followed by concentrated human services efforts to “seed” the community for lasting positive change. The 1998 Budget Bill directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to evaluate the existing Weed and Seed programs.

This evaluation report documents the implementation of Weed and Seed in four sites: Lynchburg, Norfolk, Petersburg, and Winchester. Each target site is located in an inner-city area and has a recent history of community deterioration and disproportionate crime problems. Descriptive and process information about each program site and its grant-funded activities were obtained through site visits and reviews of Weed and Seed grant documents. In addition, crime statistics for the third year of the program were gathered from local law enforcement agencies.

The designs of the local Weed and Seed programs varied widely across the four sites because program characteristics in the target communities have been influenced by locally-identified needs and existing community services. Despite these differences, each site has attempted to reduce crime through a number of intensive enforcement strategies. These Weed activities include increased police patrols and the promotion of police-resident relationships through community-oriented policing techniques.

Additionally, each locality engaged in Seed activities which focused on providing human services and developing community mobilization and involvement. Most localities increased services for target area youth with the cooperation of existing providers. Adults also received limited services in most sites. Community mobilization was encouraged through involvement in new and existing community organizations and associations. In an effort to revitalize and increase compliance in target area neighborhoods, code enforcement activities also increased.

The evaluation also attempted to assess the impact of the programs on local crime rates. The Budget Bill language directing this evaluation specifically stated that the study should examine longitudinal effects of the programs on overall crime rates in the target areas. The ability to make assessments was particularly compromised by the ongoing transition from the UCR (Uniform Crime Reports) to IBR (Incident-Based Reporting) crime reporting systems. Because variations in numbers of reported offense and arrests may be due to UCR / IBR transition issues rather than actual program effects in the target areas, comparisons across time are not presented in this report.

Although it has not been feasible to thoroughly assess the impact of Weed and Seed, preliminary evidence suggests that the program shows potential as a way to focus coordinated community efforts against crime. Local Weed and Seed coordinators indicated that they are encouraged by the program, and every Weed and Seed site has plans to continue the program, at least in part. However, each locality has experienced challenges with struggling components throughout the project, specifically those that require high community involvement and strong leadership.

Because the state's financial support of the program has terminated, the evaluators have developed specific recommendations to guide future development of Weed and Seed programs at the local level. These recommendations address the following issues:

- Improving resident "buy-in" and support of Weed and Seed activities,
- Enhancing the role of the prosecutor in the Weed component,
- Improving needs assessment techniques when planning Seed activities,
- Facilitating strong leadership and interagency cooperation,
- Increasing private sector involvement, and
- Creating program coordinator positions for each local program.

Specific information which explains and supports each recommendation is located in the complete report. In addition, a general discussion of planning issues and strategies is presented to guide state program administrators who initiate complex community-based programming projects like Weed and Seed in the future.

II. REPORT AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

Item 449 of the 1998 Budget Bill directed the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services to "review the impact" of the Commonwealth's Weed and Seed programs funded to date (see Appendix A). As directed by Item 449, interim and final evaluation reports were delivered to the Chairs of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees in October 1998 and July 1999, respectively. This report serves as a follow-up to the 1999 report.

Overall, the evaluation project reviewed the implementation and impact of Weed and Seed programs developed through Virginia's Weed and Seed Initiative. This report describes the Virginia initiative and its implementation in each program site, as well as the evaluation methodology, findings, and recommendations. A specific review of program activities during the third year of program operations is also included. Programs initiated through the federal Weed and Seed initiative, which are located in the Virginia cities of Richmond and Charlottesville, are not included in the scope of this study.

III. PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The National Weed and Seed Program

Weed and Seed programming emerged as a federal grant program in 1991. In general, the intent of Weed and Seed is to eliminate violent and drug-related crime from targeted neighborhoods and to provide safer living environments for residents in high-crime areas. The term “Weed” represents law enforcement and prosecutorial efforts to suppress and eradicate crime, and the term “Seed” represents programs and services designed to turn a troubled community into a strong community where crime cannot take root (Executive Office for Weed and Seed, 2000a).

Multiple factors guided the development of Weed and Seed as a national strategy (Roehl, Huitt, Wycoff, Pate, Rebovich & Coyle, 1996). Initially, several law enforcement projects in the Philadelphia area stimulated interest in collaborative criminal justice services. These projects had engaged cooperation among federal, state, and local agencies, as well as community organizations and neighborhood residents. In addition, research indicated that intensive enforcement efforts could be effective, but suggested including collateral strategies for greater impact. Cited strategies included citizen-based anti-drug efforts, prosecutorial collaboration, community policing, and multi-agency / multi-level collaborations. According to the National Institute of Justice’s (NIJ) Evaluation of Weed and Seed Cross-Site Analysis, as of July 1999, the number of sites nationwide that were served by Weed and Seed reached two hundred (NIJ, 1999b).

Previous evaluations of federal Weed and Seed programs suggest that many factors can effect the successful implementation. For example, a recent evaluation of federal Weed and Seed programs suggests that crime reductions may be easier to achieve in areas that have very high crime rates, but no “deep-seated” crime problems (National Institute of Justice, 1999b). “Deep-seated” crimes are crimes such as gang violence, which may be firmly embedded in a community. Additionally, the National Evaluation determined that it is often easier to revitalize targeted neighborhoods closest to thriving commercial areas. Localities such as Pittsburgh, PA and Shreveport, LA, both of which have declining industries, have found revitalization efforts to be difficult (NIJ, 1999b). The stability of the population living in the targeted area is another factor that the National Evaluation reports may effect the successful implementation of Weed and Seed. Research has shown that it is often more difficult for Seed programs to “take root” or community policing to build strong community relations in areas with highly transient populations (NIJ, 1999b). Studies also suggest that it is usually more effective to concentrate the majority of program resources on a relatively small target area (NIJ, 1999a; Delaware Statistical Analysis Center, 1998). The more narrowly defined the targeted population, the greater the chance of success in fighting crime with a limited budget.

In addition to the previously mentioned factors, research indicates that it is also important that residents living in targeted areas get involved in Weed and Seed during the implementation phases of the program. Early involvement is necessary because residents of targeted areas may initially be resentful that their neighborhood has been singled out for increased law enforcement efforts and may be reluctant to get involved if not fully informed early in the process (NIJ,

1999b). An evaluation of the Springfield, IL program concluded that residents should be involved with Weed and Seed even before public announcement of the project through the news media (Hanna, 1993). When residents are fully informed and included in program planning early on, they are less likely to see Weed and Seed as a form of harassment, will feel empowered to take responsibility for their neighborhood, and be more likely to cooperate with law enforcement efforts.

The successful implementation of Weed and Seed not only requires commitment by residents of the community but also requires active and constructive leadership of key individuals (NIJ, 1999b). This includes police personnel, community leaders, program staff, and prosecuting attorneys. The most effective leaders foster an environment of collaboration and coordination. According to the National Evaluation, those communities whose leaders were the most divided and discordant struggled the most with implementation of Weed and Seed. Other communities had problems with weak prosecution of Weed and Seed cases due to various institutional, political, and judicial issues (NIJ, 1999b). As a result, repeat offenders were often released on parole leading to the extreme dissatisfaction of program officials and residents. An active and aggressive prosecutor is needed to ensure that Weed and Seed cases receive special attention; however, this element was lacking in most of the eight sites examined (NIJ, 1999b).

Finally, the National Evaluation of Weed and Seed revealed that although private sector investment is essential to ensuring the success of Weed and Seed, most sites gave this component very little attention (NIJ, 1999b). Ideally, representatives from the private sector should work closely with public agencies to design, develop, and implement Weed and Seed activities (Delaware Statistical Analysis Center, 1998).

Description of the Virginia Initiative

Virginia became active in the federal Weed and Seed project in 1992 when the City of Richmond was awarded federal funds to begin a local program. Richmond's Weed and Seed project was the only such project funded in the state until 1997. At that time, Governor George Allen introduced a state initiative to fund similar projects in other high-need localities. In May 1997, approximately \$1 million in state grant funds was made available to Virginia localities for the first year of the Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative. In general, this program sought to improve the quality of life for residents living in particularly distressed neighborhoods (DCJS, 1999a). Modeled after the U.S. Department of Justice's Federal Weed and Seed initiative, the Virginia Weed and Seed project was in operation for three full years in the localities of Lynchburg, Norfolk, Winchester, and Petersburg. State funding for these programs was discontinued on June 30, 2000.

The specific goals and strategies of Virginia's Weed and Seed effort are outlined below. These guiding principles have remained unchanged since program onset.

Program Goals

As outlined in the Virginia “Weed and Seed” Initiative guidance documents (DCJS, 1997, 1998, 1999b), the program was designed to “focus the resources of the state and localities in a high-priority, multi-disciplinary strategy to reduce drug-related and other violent crime, and the fear of crime in Virginia’s communities.” The broad goals of the program are:

- To develop a comprehensive, multi-agency strategy to eliminate violent crime, drug trafficking and drug-related crime from targeted high-crime neighborhoods.
- To establish and sustain strong community commitment, through local government and private sector partnerships, a safe environment, free of crime, for law-abiding citizens to live, work and raise a family.
- To help residents eliminate causes of crime within the community and stabilize the quality of life through viable employment, education, housing, economic development, recreation, treatment, crime prevention, victims services and community corrections initiatives.
- To enhance and maintain safe school environments through partnerships between law enforcement, education, private sector resource providers and social service agency providers.

Program Elements

Virginia Weed and Seed programs, consistent with the philosophies of the federal Weed and Seed initiative, used a two-pronged approach to reduce drug-related and violent crime in certain targeted, high crime neighborhoods (Executive Office for Weed and Seed, 2000a; DCJS, 1999a). The first approach--“weeding”--involves concentrated law enforcement efforts to eradicate crime. The second component--“seeding”-- aims to transform targeted areas from high crime areas into places where crime cannot thrive. The program guidelines (DCJS, 1997, 1998, 1999b) outlined the four major strategies that were expected to be incorporated into local Weed and Seed project designs:

1. Suppression Strategy

This strategy is the foundation of the Weed component. Suppression includes “enforcement, adjudication, prosecution, and supervision activities designed to target, apprehend and incapacitate violent street criminals...” Such activities may include special operations such as street sweeps, and often involve coordinated law enforcement efforts.

2. Community-Oriented Policing Strategy

Community-oriented policing is conceptualized as the “bridge” between the Weed component and the Seed component. This strategy focuses on increased enforcement visibility and developing collaborative relationships between police and community residents.

3. Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Strategy

Prevention, intervention, and treatment function as the first steps in the Seed process. This strategy incorporates the intensive provision of human services to thwart the return of criminal

behaviors, mobilize residents for involvement, and provide community support. Activities under this strategy may be oriented towards youth, adults, schools, and / or the community as a whole.

4. *Neighborhood Restoration Strategy*

This strategy serves as the second step in the Seed programming component. Neighborhood restoration is targeted to improve the quality of life in distressed neighborhoods and to foster individual responsibility for community issues. Activities typically focus on increasing economic development, improving living conditions, and providing expanded educational, economic, social and recreational opportunities.

Differences between Virginia and Federal Program Requirements

Although Virginia Weed and Seed programs are modeled after the federal Weed and Seed initiative, there are some notable differences between federal and state Weed and Seed requirements. First, recent federal guidelines specify that the majority of Weed and Seed funds must be used to support Seed activities (Executive Office for Weed and Seed, 2000b). In contrast, Virginia specified that the majority of funds be allocated to Weed activities in the first two years but made no specifications during the third grant cycle.

Another major difference between federal and state Weed and Seed requirements is that, unlike federal programs, Virginia does not require each site to have a designated Safe Haven. Safe Havens, as specified under federal Weed and Seed guidelines, are multi-service centers where a variety of youth and adult services are coordinated in a highly visible, accessible facility (Executive Office for Weed and Seed, 2000b).

In addition to the slightly different program requirements, Virginia Weed and Seed programs and the federal Weed and Seed initiative also vary slightly in their respective goals. For example, the federal Weed and Seed initiative mentions preventing, controlling, and reducing gang activity as a key goal (Executive Office for Weed and Seed, 2000a). No reference to eradicating gang activity is included in guidelines for Virginia's Weed and Seed programs. In addition, Virginia's Weed and Seed guidelines specifically outline enhancing and maintaining the safety of school environments as a goal (VDCS, 1997, 1998, 1999b). However, this goal is not included for the federal program.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE OVERVIEW

In 1997, invitations to apply for Weed and Seed funds were sent to twenty Virginia localities that were classified as having the greatest need. Localities with the greatest need were determined by identifying those with the highest combined violent crime and drug arrest rate, averaged over a three-year period. Thirteen of the twenty eligible localities applied for these funds. Although the original solicitation for Weed and Seed funds indicated that four sites would receive funding, five recipients were ultimately selected in 1997: Lynchburg, Norfolk, Petersburg, Portsmouth, and Winchester.

Grant Requirements

Localities were required to commit a minimum 10% local cash match during the first year, 35% in the second year, and 50% in the third year of the grant program. In addition, all funded localities were required to create a local Virginia Weed and Seed Committee to advise the effort. Each Committee was required to include, at minimum, the chief administrative officer of the jurisdiction, the chief law enforcement officer, the Commonwealth's Attorney, a citizen representative of the target neighborhood(s), an education official, and the chief human services official of the local government. Weed and Seed programs were required to submit progress reports to DCJS to document grant activities, as well as quarterly financial reports to document expenditures. During the second and third grant years, localities were also required to submit information to support the evaluation effort.

Review of Awards

Communities who received funding were granted significant flexibility in developing local initiatives to meet local needs. However, in the first and second years, a minimum of 60% of the funding request was required to be set aside for Weed and Community-Oriented Policing activities. No requirements were imposed during the third year regarding the distribution of funds between program elements.

During the 1997-1998 grant cycle, administrative and funding support for the local Weed and Seed sites were provided by DCJS and the Department of Social Services (DSS). DCJS provided approximately \$700,000 of the available funds from the state's Intensified Drug Enforcement Assistance (IDEA) grant funds, which are allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Public Safety. DSS supplied an additional \$300,000 in available funds. Weed monies were extracted from the DCJS contribution while Seed monies were provided by DSS. Funding and administrative support for the second and third years were provided solely by DCJS.

All five sites submitted applications to request second-year funding. This request was denied in the Portsmouth site due to program non-compliance¹. Although program expansion was originally anticipated, no additional program sites were funded in the second or third grant years. All five sites also submitted applications to request third-year funding which was again restricted to the five existing Weed and Seed sites. Localities were also not permitted to expand or alter the boundaries of target areas during the second or third years. A summary of state-funded Weed and Seed awards for each grant cycle is displayed in Table 1.

¹ After a significant delay, Portsmouth was granted extensions through June 30, 1999 in order to spend its first-year funds. Consequently, Portsmouth was allowed two years to complete its first grant funding cycle. Because this situation is so different from the other sites, Portsmouth was not included in this evaluation study.

Table 1
Weed and Seed Grant Awards, Expenditures, and Percentage Expended / State Funds *
1997 – 2000

Locality	Grant Period	State Award	Expenditures	% of Award Expended	Average % Expended over 3 years
Lynchburg	Year 1	\$188,424	\$183,253	97%	95%
	Year 2	\$119,625	\$107,070	90%	
	Year 3	\$ 94,306	**\$ 91,316	97%	
Norfolk	Year 1	\$202,500	\$177,898	88%	91%
	Year 2	\$146,249	\$133,168	91%	
	Year 3	\$112,189	**\$106,870	95%	
Petersburg	Year 1	\$194,500	\$118,240	61%	67%
	Year 2	\$ 92,563	\$ 78,121	84%	
	Year 3	\$ 66,730	**\$ 39,206	59%	
Winchester	Year 1	\$200,123	\$141,969	71%	74%
	Year 2	\$132,184	\$ 94,245	71%	
	Year 3	\$ 90,790	**\$ 77,054	85%	

* Figures represent state funds only. Local matching funds are not included.

** Third year figures for expenditures are based on amounts the locality had expended and obligated to be expended as of September 1, 2000.

A review of expended State award funds in each program site indicates that over the three-year grant period, Lynchburg spent an average of 95% its award, Norfolk spent 91%, Winchester spent 74%, and Petersburg spent 67%.

V. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This evaluation incorporates qualitative and quantitative data from three primary sources: (1) site visits and personal interviews with local Weed and Seed Program Coordinators and program staff; (2) reviews of grant applications, supporting materials, and grant reporting documents; and (3) target area reporting documentation. Each type of data is discussed in further detail below. Because the type and sophistication of data collection systems varies across localities, the measures available to support the evaluation differed in each local Weed and Seed site.

Data Sources

Site Visits and Program Staff Interviews

Evaluators conducted two site visits to each Weed and Seed program reviewed in this report. During each site visit, lengthy interviews were conducted with Weed and Seed staff using interview instruments constructed by the evaluation team. Generally, the individuals interviewed at each site included the program coordinators from both the Weed side and the Seed side, a supervising law enforcement officer from the target area, a crime analyst and / or information systems personnel, and Seed staff.

The preliminary evaluation interview was conducted at each program site in June 1998. In general, interview questions prompted staff to specify the program components, describe the activities funded under the Weed and Seed program, and review the existing data collection and reporting protocols. Second site visits were conducted during Spring 1999. At this time, interviewers collected more detailed information on each program and its operations. Interview questions covered a number of different topics, including target area descriptions, reviews of needs assessment strategies used in program development, obstacles to program implementation, program administration, staffing, grant reporting, and staff perceptions of program impact.

A number of brief, follow-up interviews were conducted as needed by phone during the last year of the evaluation to obtain updated information about local activities and program perceptions.

Administrative Document Review

Program evaluators also reviewed numerous administrative documents throughout the course of the project. These documents included the grant solicitation for each funding cycle, grant applications for each program site, and all grant progress and evaluation reporting forms. The documents were used to further understand the grant requirements, program design, implementation of each local program, and crime trends in the target areas.

Target Area Data

Although grant progress reports from each Weed and Seed site were required by DCJS, no specific evaluation data reporting requirements for grantees were established at the onset of the Weed and Seed program. Consequently, a review of documentation provided by each locality revealed significant differences in the type, amount and specificity of program performance information available in each Weed and Seed site. The lack of standardized and consistent reporting by the sites led evaluators to develop a three-section standardized reporting form implemented in December 1998, to capture the following information:

Section I: Monthly submission of target area crime statistics (offenses and arrests reported) derived from local Uniform Crime Report (UCR) or Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) systems.

Section II: Monthly data for other activities within the target area (e.g., hours of police presence, quantities of drugs seized, other special activities, etc.).

Section III A and B: A quarterly narrative intended to collect specific information not captured in other existing reports (e.g., numbers of participants in Seed programs, program implementation obstacles, etc.).

These reports were used to update program descriptions and assess the impacts of Weed and Seed in each target area. While the breadth of available information varied significantly across localities, most sites were able to provide basic information and indicators on Weed and Seed-funded activities in the target areas. (See Appendix B for a copy of the Evaluation Reporting Forms.)

Limitations on Use of Target Area Crime Statistics

Although monthly crime statistics were collected on the standardized evaluation reports, data issues emerged as the reports were compiled for analysis purposes. While evaluators intended to use these data to help assess the impact of Weed and Seed programs on crime levels in the target areas, limitations precluded their use for this purpose.

Most importantly, the transition from UCR to IBR data reporting systems presented significant data interpretation problems. During the time span of the Weed and Seed evaluation, Virginia localities were transitioning their offense / arrest reporting systems from the UCR to the IBR system. In effect, these transition experiences resulted in reporting / formatting variations for some portion of the study period in each site. This problem essentially nullified the utility of crime data comparisons across multiple years within one program site, as well as comparisons across program sites. Because variations in numbers of reported offenses and arrests may be due to UCR - IBR translation issues rather than changes in actual numbers of offenses and arrests in the target areas, these types of comparisons are not presented in this report. In addition, the availability of data for selected offense / arrest categories also varied across sites during the transitional period. Therefore, longitudinal effects of the program could not be measured as was requested by the General Assembly in the 1998 Budget Bill.

Complete IBR data were available for only the 1999 – 2000 grant year; therefore, offense and arrest figures are examined during the third year only. Data reporting the most common types of arrests are presented for each Weed and Seed locality. Additionally, supplementary data (e.g., calls-for-service, etc.) are provided as very general indicators of crime activity in the target areas. However, these data are subject to local reporting variations and also cannot be compared across localities.

VI. REVIEW OF LOCAL PROGRAMS

Descriptive information about local program sites was obtained through a review of grant documents and reports, and through interviews with program coordinators and local staff. This section emphasizes the program components most directly funded with Virginia Weed and Seed monies. Existing services within each project site may be noted but are not discussed in detail.

In general, the program components for each locality included law enforcement activities, community policing, and prevention / intervention / restoration activities. The program summaries that follow include a brief description of each Weed and Seed community and a summary of each locality's overall three-year program strategy, followed by detailed information that describes the third-year grant activities. Grant activity information includes a list of items funded by the third-year budget, descriptions of the program activities, and a review of the community's continuation plan, if applicable. Specifically, suppression strategies and community-oriented policing activities are included in the discussion of Weed activities. Information regarding prevention, intervention, and treatment strategies, as well as neighborhood restoration strategies, are included under Seed activities.

A review of relevant local target area data and Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) arrest statistics was also conducted for each program locality. Based on this review, each target area's most frequent arrest data and other supplemental findings are examined. Notable implementation challenges encountered in each locality are also discussed. Next, local program coordinators provided their comments and perceptions about the Weed and Seed program in their communities. Finally, reported plans for continued program activities are discussed.

LYNCHBURG

Description of the Community

Lynchburg is a small to medium-sized city (pop. 66,049)² located in Central Virginia. Like many older cities, its downtown area has experienced some inner-city decline. Lynchburg's target area for the Weed and Seed project consists of two adjacent neighborhoods, College Hill and Tinbridge Hill. These neighborhoods are located near the downtown central business district and are just over one square mile combined, or about 2% of the city's land area.

Both neighborhoods are primarily residential, and housing consists of mostly older structures, although College Hill does contain some newer subsidized apartment complexes. The two neighborhoods are divided by Fifth Street, a struggling business thoroughfare.

² City and target area population figures used throughout this report were obtained from 1990 Census data, U.S. Department of Commerce, or census data reported in the grant application.

Overview of Program Strategies

In general, Lynchburg's Weed and Seed program emphasized: (1) drug offense reduction through increased surveillance operations, investigations, and checkpoints; (2) increased patrols to affect order maintenance; (3) targeting code violations and blighted properties; (4) youth activities and mentoring; and (5) home repair and restoration. During its three years of funding, Lynchburg's Weed and Seed program maintained a consistent program structure. Only minor changes were made in activities over the three-year period as the program responded to changing community needs.

Suppression activities included drug offense reduction techniques such as drug sting operations and drug checkpoints, as well as the involvement of the Narcotics Strike Force (NSF). Investigations that included covert operations and surveillance techniques were also used to target drug offenses. Early in the program, suppression of prostitution was targeted with reverse prostitution stings. Increased patrols in the target area neighborhoods were also implemented to maintain order and reduce nuisance violations. In the last year of the program, a truancy reduction initiative was developed and implemented in cooperation with the Lynchburg City Schools.

Community-Oriented Policing activities included cross-training two NSF officers in code enforcement. These officers were able to identify code violations while they carried out their normal duties in the target area. Code violations were reported to the Code Enforcement Task Force (CETF), and forwarded to the appropriate city agency for response. The same officers also coordinated meetings with the managers of area housing facilities to discuss on-going problems and possible solutions. Additionally, blighted properties were referred to CETF by officers for eventual repair, rehabilitation, or demolition. Officers assigned to the target area also attended Neighborhood Association and Neighborhood Watch meetings throughout the three-year period.

Seed activities such as prevention, intervention, treatment and neighborhood restoration began in the first year with a needs-based approach. Neighborhood Summit meetings were resident focus groups conducted to discuss concerns and identify services needed in the neighborhoods. A Mini-Grant program was then established for groups and organizations to apply for funds to provide the needed services. Programs funded by the Mini-Grants generally focused on youth activities and education, mentoring, job skills, and home repair. In addition, an annual Citywide Neighborhood Convention, which included the neighborhoods in the target area, offered workshops and exhibits of community programs and services. A program called "Natural Leader" was also developed to train target area residents to become effective leaders. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles were exercised and taught by community police officers in an effort to make properties less susceptible to crime. Finally, reduction of illegal dumping was made a priority to increase the attractiveness and health of the area.

Description of the Lynchburg Program – Third Year

For the third year of Weed and Seed funding, Lynchburg's program was approved for the following activities:

- Overtime (3,650 hours) for police officers to supplement enforcement and community policing efforts in the target area;
- Surveillance and technical equipment to enhance the police department's enforcement efforts (e.g., digital camcorder, surveillance van, cell phones, etc.);
- Salary, benefits, and other support for a Community Organizer position;
- Supplemental salaries for Community Centers' staff to expand their hours of operation; and
- Various target area neighborhood programs awarded through the Mini-Grant initiative.

Funds were also made available to send representatives to a planning conference and for program-related printing / office supplies.

Weed and Community-Oriented Policing Activities

In the third year, activities started late due to delays in the Lynchburg City Council's grant approval process. Most Weed activities did not begin until September 1999. Narcotic Strike Force officers led many of the activities in the target area and cooperated with numerous agencies in implementing these actions. Generally, Weed activities included:

- Additional patrols by beat officers and NSF officers;
- Attending Neighborhood Watch meetings in the target area;
- Meetings between NSF officers and area apartment managers;
- Cooperating with the city's Code Enforcement Task Force to target blighted properties; and
- Numerous law enforcement operations such as surveillance operations, prostitution reversals, truancy details, warrant service operations, buy-bust operations, mock drug checkpoints, and directed patrols.

Two specific activities highlighted below, were particularly notable during the third year.

1. Meetings between NSF officers and area apartment managers. NSF officers met numerous times with housing facility managers from two target area complexes to find solutions to on-going problems. Crime prevention and reduction techniques were discussed at the meetings, such as posting and strict enforcement of a "No Trespassing" ordinance. Officers also encouraged property managers to exchange information about their problem tenants to help reduce the shifting of problems from one complex to another. The officers also discussed lighting and other design principles to help reduce crime and criminal opportunity. As a specific example, a problem identified by one complex was that much drug activity and other problems occurred around a gazebo on the property. The management and residents agreed that the gazebo should be removed, so it was donated to a local cemetery. After removal of the gazebo, neighbors noticed improved conditions and a decrease in the high volume of problems that occurred near the structure's former location.

2. Truancy Reduction Initiative. The Lynchburg City school system and Lynchburg Police Department partnered to develop a truancy reduction program. Children identified as truant were returned to school (or returned home if on suspension), then referred to a mentoring program. Target area children were included in this effort and were referred to either Sisters of Unity and Leadership or Brothers United for Christ, two Seed-sponsored mentoring programs.

Weed efforts were often conducted in collaboration with other local organizations. Lynchburg's multi-department Code Enforcement Task Force took the lead in the effort to target blighted properties, guided largely by referrals from NSF officers to specific problem properties in the target area. The Virginia ABC and Sheriff's Offices of several neighboring localities also provided law enforcement assistance. As noted earlier, truancy operations were conducted in partnership with the City schools. Additionally, Lynchburg Police collaborated with area schools in developing crisis intervention procedures at schools that served target area youth. Finally, the Lynchburg Fire Department and Public Works Department assisted the Lynchburg Police Department with the removal of the gazebo mentioned above.

Seed Activities

Lynchburg's Seed strategy is organized as a Mini-Grant program where organizations compete to obtain funds to serve the target area. Due to local delays in obtaining approval for the use of grant funds, the Mini-Grants in the Seed initiative adopted a different schedule than that of the normal grant year. Subsequently, the second year's Mini-Grant programs did not end until September 15, 1999. Third year Mini-Grant seed programs were funded and began operation on December 21, 1999, and are scheduled to end on September 22, 2000.

Mini-Grant awards ranged between \$1,000 and \$4,000. The programs that received funding in the third grant year were:

- Sisters of Unity and Leadership (SOUL), a mentoring program for girls age 8 - 17;
- Brothers United for Christ (BUC), a mentoring program for boys age 8 - 18;
- Tinbridge Hill Youth Incentive and College Hill Youth Incentive, programs to educate and interest kids in the benefits and outcomes of community service;
- Tinbridge Hill Homeowner Assistance and College Hill Homeowner Assistance, programs to improve housing conditions through repair and improvement;
- Releve, a youth dance program sponsored by the Dance Theatre of Lynchburg; and
- the Dr. Johnson Video Project, a planned documentation of the oral history concerning Dr. R. Walter Johnson, a tennis coach / trainer whose students included Althea Gibson and Arthur Ashe.

Some of the activities that youth in the mentoring and community service programs participated in included YMCA volunteer opportunities, organized neighborhood clean-ups, fundraisers to pay for field trips, and hosting various community events. The Tinbridge Hill Homeowner Assistance completed minor repairs on five homes and planted a community vegetable garden while the College Hill Homeowner Assistance completed minor repairs on eight homes and established a tool library so that members of the community can borrow lawn equipment and tools. Releve, the youth dance program, hosted the Alvin Alley Performance for a fundraising

event. Finally, the Dr. Johnson Video Project participants researched background information and conducted interviews with family members. The tennis courts where Dr. Johnson trained Althea Gibson and Arthur Ashe were rededicated in his name.

Other Seed-funded projects in the Lynchburg target area included the Citywide Neighborhood Convention, where neighborhood groups and area agencies displayed information about their programs and conducted meetings on topics such as employment skills and home ownership. Additionally, Lynchburg's leadership training course for target area leaders continued in the third year. Lynchburg's Seed monies also funded a full-time Community Organizer position that was staffed at Youth and Prevention Services within the Lynchburg Department of Human Services. This person coordinated the Mini-Grant program, provided technical assistance to the Mini-Grant program staff, conducted on-site visits to observe activities, elicited support from the community, attended Neighborhood Council meetings, and filed reports to the necessary agencies. The establishment of this position has greatly enhanced implementation of the Seed program in Lynchburg.

Other non-funded activities in the Weed and Seed target area included activities such as National Night Out, a national crime prevention awareness effort; an AIDS awareness workshop; and computer training for target area residents.

Obstacles to Program Implementation

Lynchburg's City Council's procedural process delayed local approval of third-year Weed and Seed funding. The program could not begin implementation until September 1, 1999. Also, the homeowner assistance programs experienced occasional delays in scheduled repair work due to contractors' work obligations outside of the program.

Summary of Program Activities

Lynchburg's Weed activities highlighted enforcement and community policing largely through increased patrol hours and interagency partnerships. Seed programming was primarily addressed through several Mini-Grant programs that addressed community needs.

During the third year of the Weed and Seed program in Lynchburg, Weed funds supported an average of 59 part-time and full-time officers who worked an average of 299 hours in the target area per month. Over the span of the final grant year, 105 law enforcement special operations were conducted. These resulted in 231 arrests, 32% of which were for drug violations. Additionally, two DUI checkpoint operations resulted in a total of 6 DUI charges and 7 drug arrests. A breakdown of additional enforcement activities is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2
Additional Enforcement Activities
Lynchburg - Third Year

Activity Description	Number
Prostitution Reversal	4
Surveillance Operation	20
Cocaine Reversal	3
Truancy Detail	22
Buy-Bust Operation	2
Multi-Agency Operations	6

The truancy detail, which was initiated in the third year, resulted in contacts with 154 truant youth. Of these, 105 were returned to school, 39 were returned home due to suspensions from school, and 10 were not enrolled in Lynchburg City Schools. In addition, Weed and Seed officers attended 36 target area Neighborhood Watch meetings during the grant year.

Calls-for-service in the target area averaged 300 a month, comprising about 4% of the citywide total. Fifty-two firearms were seized in the target area during the third grant year, which accounted for about 40% of the firearms seized citywide. Based on street value, a total of \$24,367 worth of illegal drugs (including opiates, cocaine, and derivatives; marijuana; synthetic narcotics; and other dangerous non-narcotics) was seized in the target area during the third grant year. This amount represents approximately 42% of the city's total dollar amount of illicit drugs seized.

The Lynchburg Seed effort in the third year included a Neighborhood Summit attended by approximately 70 target area residents and Neighborhood Plan focus group sessions attended by over 50 residents of the College Hill and Tinbridge Hill neighborhoods. Participation in the Seed Mini-Grant programs is described in Table 3.

Table 3
Mini-Grant Programs Participation
Lynchburg - Third Year

Program Name	Age Range of Participants	Number of Participants
Sisters of Unity and Leadership	8 - 17	8
Tinbridge Hill Youth Incentive	8 - 13	30
Tinbridge Hill Homeowner Assistance	N/A	5 home repairs
Brothers United for Christ	8 - 18	25
College Hill Homeowner Assistance	N/A	8 home repairs
College Hill Youth Incentive	3 - 17	15
Releve	8 - 18	unavailable
Dr. Johnson Video Project	6 - 60	200

Arrest Statistics for the Lynchburg Target Area

Each Weed and Seed site submitted monthly IBR data to DCJS for their target area. In analyzing Lynchburg’s IBR offense and arrest data, no particular trends or patterns were found. While there was a significant spike in the number of most reported offenses between the second and third quarters, Lynchburg Police Department’s Crime Analyst attributed this to the installation of a new, fully IBR-compliant records management system.

Table 4 displays the three most common types of arrests made in the Lynchburg target area during the third year of the grant. This illustrates the most common arrest activities of the Weed and Seed officers.

Table 4 Most Common Arrests in Target Area Lynchburg - Third Year	
Type	Number
Drug / Narcotic Violations *	163
Simple Assault	97
DUI	60

* Includes drug equipment violations

The arrests made for these three offenses, drug / narcotic violations, simple assault, and DUI, represent 59% of all arrests made in the target area. Simple assaults made up 80% of all assaults in the target area. See Appendix C for the third year IBR offense and arrest data for Lynchburg's target area.

Summary Assessment by Local Weed and Seed Coordinators

At the end of the third year of the Weed and Seed program, local program coordinators were asked their opinions about the grant activities they were most pleased with as well as those which did not fulfill expectations. Lynchburg officials identified several different facets of the Weed and Seed program with which they were particularly satisfied. Specifically, Lynchburg reports that response to the Weed and Seed program from the community has been very positive. The coordinators indicated that community really worked toward making positive changes and residents have shown great support for the program. Community leadership training and the youth programs were very popular with residents. Additionally, new partnerships were established between the police, citizens, government agencies, non-government service providers, and private groups. These enhanced partnerships have reportedly led to a more mutually trusting relationship between citizens and police.

However, some desired accomplishments were not realized. Lynchburg had hoped to encourage local government agencies to work with the communities and learn to respond to the requests and needs of the citizens. For example, when the College Hill neighborhood opposed a local restaurant's application for a ABC permit, some members of City Council appeared not to consider the neighborhood's wishes. Also, although many significant improvements were made and continue to be made, coordinators indicated that progress took a bit longer in the College Hill neighborhood as they did not have the same support organizations in place at the start of the grant as did the Tinbridge Hill neighborhood.

Continuation Plans

The following activities, which were initially funded with Weed and Seed funds, will reportedly continue to operate in the target area after the grant is terminated.

- The Community Organizer will continue to operate as a full-time staff position in Youth and Prevention Services and will be funded by the City.
- The homeowner assistance programs will continue with support from volunteers, churches, Habitat for Humanity and the local Housing Authority.
- Brothers United for Christ and Sisters of Unity and Leadership will collaborate on future projects and will receive support through the YMCA and a local church.
- Funds are currently unavailable to maintain heightened enforcement levels. However, the Lynchburg Police Department is undergoing a major restructuring in January 2001 due to the department's new deployment strategy. The new departmental organization will result in a true community-oriented policing arrangement with officers assigned and accountable to their appointed neighborhoods.

NORFOLK

Description of the Community

Norfolk is one of Virginia's largest and most populous cities (pop. 261,229). Located on the Chesapeake Bay, it covers approximately 50 square miles. Norfolk's target area for the Weed and Seed program is located directly south of the downtown district and is referred to as Southside. This area covers just over two square miles and consists of three neighborhoods: Berkley, Campostella, and Campostella Heights.

Berkley is the largest of the three neighborhoods and consists about equally of industrially developed waterfront and residential areas. Campostella and Campostella Heights are predominately residential and include two of Norfolk's subsidized housing developments, Oakleaf Forest and Diggstown.

Overview of Program Strategies

Norfolk's Weed and Seed program emphasized reducing drug trafficking and drug-related crimes, maintaining good police / resident relations, attending community meetings with target area residents and reducing juvenile crime by increasing youth opportunity. Norfolk's Weed and Seed activities closely followed its original program structure for all three years of funding. Some changes occurred in Seed programming as was necessitated by staff turnover. It is notable that Norfolk developed some measurable outcome objectives for both the Weed and Seed programs. However, data limitations, most markedly the UCR to IBR transition, precluded the ability to accurately assess attainment of these objectives.

Suppression activities in Norfolk's target area initially focused on enhanced drug traffic investigations. Using information gathered from the investigations, the police conducted drug crackdowns and sweeps. Other enforcement activities included increased foot, bicycle and vehicle patrols, and conducting traffic checkpoints.

Community-Oriented Policing activities in the target area were primarily conducted through the officers' interactions with area residents. These interactions took place at local events where the officers provided security and at Neighborhood Association and Neighborhood Watch meetings, which were attended by the area Weed and Seed officers.

Activities that comprised the Seed effort, such as prevention, intervention, treatment and neighborhood restoration, were primarily designed for youth involvement. All Seed programs were operated by or with the assistance of the local Boys and Girls Clubs that serve the target area.

Description of the Norfolk Program – Third Year

For the third year, funding was approved for the following activities:

- Overtime (5,096 hours) for police officers to increase undercover and patrol efforts in the target area.
- A part-time and / or full-time program coordinator for each of the Seed programs, as well as training expenses.
- Speakers' fees, conference space, and supplies for a youth conference.
- Program supplies (e.g., advertisement costs, activity materials, etc.)

Weed and Community-Oriented Policing Activities

The goals of the Weed initiative in Norfolk concentrated on increasing the number of arrests, weapons seized, illegal narcotics recovered and police man-hours spent on target area patrols. Other goals included reducing the number of reported offenses, decreasing the number of calls-for-service, and maintaining a high degree of police presence. When remaining grant funds became limited, the increased police presence was slightly curtailed in order to expend funds less rapidly.

Norfolk's Weed activities focused on additional and high-impact patrols in the target area neighborhoods. Patrols consisted of four officers, usually in uniform, who worked four hours a day. Patrols were conducted on foot, in vehicles, or on bicycles. Foot patrols were sometimes directed in parks and playgrounds where it was felt they could be most effective in deterring drug activity. Sweeps and high impact patrol operations also targeted illegal drug activity. Assistance with sweep operations was provided by the Virginia State Police and the Virginia Probation and Parole office, upon request.

In addition to the increased patrols, Norfolk's Weed effort included: officers attending regular monthly meetings of the neighborhoods' civic leagues, Advisory Boards, Southside Task Force, and the Weed and Seed Steering Committee; conducting security details for various Southside events; conducting a bicycle regulations enforcement operation, safety seminars, and traffic safety checks. Partners in these efforts included Southside's Community Resource Officers. The Community Resource Officer program assigns community police officers to provide programs and services to the youth and families in public housing neighborhoods. These officers were assisted, as necessary, by the Weed and Seed officers and will continue to work cooperatively with the Seed programs conducted at the Campostella Boys and Girls Club.

Seed Activities

Norfolk's Seed initiative had as its broad focus the reduction of youth gang activity in the target area. This objective was addressed through several youth activity and delinquency prevention programs that focused on at-risk youth and were implemented at the neighborhood level. There were five key programs that benefited from Weed and Seed funds: Targeted Outreach Program, or TOP; Positive Confrontation; Youth Employment Program; Mothers Against Gangs; and Life Prep.

Targeted Outreach Program

The Targeted Outreach Program (TOP) focused on youth (ages 10 - 18) who were identified as at-risk for gang involvement. The program sought to match youth with activities that they found interesting and that could provide needed direction and guidance. This was accomplished with one-day Boys and Girls Club passes distributed to at-risk youth by partnering agencies. Youth were invited to join the Boys and Girls Club and given a scholarship to cover membership fees, if needed. Each child was assessed and referred to activities based on the assessment's findings. Activities were designed to teach health and physical education, citizenship and leadership, personal and cultural enrichment, outdoor recreation, and academic achievement. Additional programs attended by TOP participants included: Power Hour, a homework group; Smart Moves, a program designed to teach youth the dangers of sexual behavior, drugs, and alcohol; and Kids in Control, a 15-session safety awareness program designed to help kids develop crime prevention and personal safety skills.

Positive Confrontation

Positive Confrontation was a 12-week course established in five schools that serve target area youth. There was also a 4-week summer course conducted at the Boys and Girls Club. Each class consisted of 6 - 15 youth, elementary through high school age, who were referred to the program because of disruptive behavior in the classroom or at the Club. The course curriculum included sessions such as Knowing Yourself, Ways to Say No, Success and Failure, Making Decisions, Anger Management, Leadership, Teen Pregnancy, etc. Special presentations were also made to the class on a variety of topics, such as maintaining positive attitudes and anger management, education and career opportunities, and job-seeking advice.

Youth Employment Program

Youth Employment Program (a.k.a. People Getting Paid or PGP Enterprises) taught youth how to start and operate a small business. The program included one-hour sessions on topics such as

making goals, writing a business plan, dress and interview skills, and working as a team and business operations. Tutoring was offered to participants because the Youth Employment Program requires each member to improve or maintain passing grades. The program coordinator also informed participants about federal employment services programs such as Summer Aid Employment and Welfare to Work.

Mothers Against Gangs

In the Mothers Against Gangs program, parents (85% of whom were single mothers) volunteered for bus stop patrols, hall duty at school, chaperoning, and street patrols. The patrol activities focused on areas in the neighborhoods where youth interaction often led to youth conflict. The coordinator of this program was terminated in February 2000. At that time, the remaining funds were used to start the Life Prep program.

Life Prep

The Life Prep program replaced Mothers Against Gangs midway through the third grant year. Life Prep was designed as a weekly 50-minute youth discussion session. Each week a topic was introduced and a brief overview was given, followed by discussion. The program curriculum included discussions on topics such as problem solving, decision-making, job readiness, career exploration, coping with violence, alternatives to drugs and alcohol, and parenting skills. Additionally, the program provided recreational activities, educational programs, guest speakers, and educational field trips. All activities were aimed at improving interpersonal skills. Individual conferences were also conducted with each child to discuss any problems they might have.

Grant funds also supported the Weed and Seed Youth Conference 2000. This conference was organized by two Seed program coordinators and attended by youth from the target area. Speakers from area agencies and schools presented workshops on topics such as health, safety, and employment.

In addition, Norfolk's Seed programs collaborated with many area agencies and organizations. Some of these patrons assisted by referring youth to the programs while others donated space for activities, materials, or snacks for the children. Volunteers acted as speakers for workshops, and also provided tours of area facilities.

Obstacles to Program Implementation

Boys and Girls Club membership dues rose from \$3 to \$10 for a year's membership. This created a hardship for some youth. To remedy this, membership fee scholarships were made available to those youth participating in the Norfolk Seed programs as needed. In addition, the coordinator of the TOP program noted he did not encounter the kind of community and parental support he had hoped for the program. This lack of support hindered the program's outreach goals, but overall the coordinator was pleased that many of the youth who joined the Club have stayed active.

The Youth Employment program had difficulties scheduling speakers on a routine basis as originally intended. The Mothers Against Gangs program also endured problems, specifically, ineffective leadership, which led to dismissal of the coordinator and program termination.

Summary of Program Activities

Norfolk’s Weed and Seed activities focused on increased police presence through additional patrol hours and increased youth activities offered through a variety of youth-oriented programs.

During the third year of the Weed and Seed program in Norfolk, Weed funds supported an average of 34 part-time and full-time officers who worked an average of 334 hours in the target area per month. Over the span of the final grant year, 30 law enforcement special operations were conducted. Of these, 11 sweeps were executed, which resulted in 47 arrests. Seventeen percent of these arrests were for drug violations. Additionally, Norfolk Police were assisted by the Virginia State Police on six of the reported sweeps and by Virginia Probation and Parole on three sweeps. A detailed list of additional enforcement activities is displayed in Table 5.

Table 5 Additional Enforcement Activities Norfolk - Third Year	
Activity Description	Number
Buy-Bust Operation	1
Bicycle Regulations Enforcement Operation	1
Security for Neighborhood Events	10
Surveillance Operations	1
Sweeps	11
Traffic Safety Checks	6

Calls-for-service in the target area averaged 524 a month, or about 3% of the citywide total. A total of 11 firearms were seized in the target area during the third grant year, comprising about 2% of the firearms seized citywide. A total of \$56,634 worth of illegal drugs was seized in the target area during the last grant year, accounting for approximately 5% of the city’s total dollar amount of illicit drugs seized.

In addition, Norfolk’s Seed programs provided services to youth and families in the target area neighborhoods. Table 6 details the number of participants in each program and the age groups that each programs served.

**Table 6
Seed Programs Participation
Norfolk - Third Year**

Program Name	Age Range of Participants	Number of Participants
TOP (Targeted Outreach Program)	10 - 18	43
Positive Confrontation	Elementary - high school	54 during school year; 35 in summer program
Youth Employment Program	13 - 16	8
Mothers Against Gangs	Parents, grandparents and some youth	35 adults
Life Prep	10 - 16	14

During the third grant year, TOP distributed over 400 one-day passes to the Boys and Girls Club, of which 47 were used. Of the 47 youth who used the passes, 43 became members. Positive Confrontation conducted workshops and field trips in addition to their weekly class curriculum. In addition to the regular participants noted in the table, these workshops were attended by a total of 25 parents and 10 youth, and field trips were attended by 30 youth. The Weed and Seed Youth Conference 2000 was also attended by 83 youth from the target area neighborhoods.

Arrest Statistics for the Norfolk Target Area

In analyzing Norfolk’s IBR offense and arrest data for the third year of Weed and Seed, no significant trends or patterns were found. The three most common types of arrests made in the Norfolk target area are displayed in Table 7.

**Table 7
Most Common Arrests in Target Area
Norfolk - Third Year**

Type	Number
Drug / Narcotic Violations *	113
Trespass	88
Simple Assault	40

* Includes drug equipment violations

The arrests made for these three offenses, drug / narcotic violations, trespass, and simple assault, represent 34% of all arrests made in the target area. Simple assaults made up 40% of all assaults in the target area. (See Appendix C for a breakdown of IBR offense and arrest data for Norfolk's target area.)

Summary Assessment by Local Weed and Seed Coordinators

At the end of the third year of the Weed and Seed program, program coordinators were asked their opinions about the grant activities they were most pleased with as well as those which did not fulfill expectations. They identified several different facets of the Weed and Seed program with which they were particularly pleased. Coordinators reported that the police department developed invaluable ties with the community. These relationships will reportedly help the community and police work together more effectively for a long time to come. Norfolk also noted that youth outreach efforts succeeded in involving many Southside children in healthy and positive activities. The Positive Confrontation program particularly helped bridge the relationship between parents and schools by creating more communication and trust between them.

However, some desired accomplishments were not realized. The TOP program, which was so successful in its youth outreach efforts, was reportedly hindered by the lack of community and parental support it received. The Youth Employment Program coordinator was not satisfied with the year's accomplishments and believes that the program would benefit from a redesigned curriculum that emphasized business and entrepreneurial education. According to the local program administrator, the Mothers Against Gangs program had a promising start, but suffered from poor leadership.

Continuation Plans

Although the additional police patrols funded through Weed and Seed will no longer be active in the Southside, the focused community initiatives and knowledge gained over the last three years have informed the regular patrols of better ways to provide services in the area.

Two of the funded Seed programs will continue to provide services to youth in the target area. The TOP program will operate from the Diggstown Boys and Girls Club location, and the Positive Confrontation program will function in one or two schools during the academic year.

Norfolk hopes to provide other similar activities and services as those that were funded under the Weed and Seed grant through a four-year federal grant program called "Community Quest." The program emphasizes reducing substance abuse among youth and will involve parents and adults in its efforts.

PETERSBURG

Description of the Community

Petersburg is a small city (pop. 38,386) located in south central Virginia approximately 30 miles south of Richmond. It has a historic, but struggling, downtown district that endures a declining industrial economy.

Petersburg's Weed and Seed target area is made up of three adjacent neighborhoods: Ravenscroft, Delectable Heights and the Harding Street area. The target area is home to approximately 4,690 low-to-moderate income residents who reside in both public and privately-owned housing. All three neighborhoods share similar problems such as drug-related crimes and blighted conditions.

Overview of Program Strategies

Petersburg's Weed and Seed program focused on the following activities: eradication of drug-related crime, restoration or demolition of blighted properties, and provision of youth services. Petersburg also closely followed its original program structure for all three years of Weed and Seed funding. Small variations were made in the grant's activities due to staff turnover in the programs.

Activities that comprised Petersburg's suppression strategy included narcotic investigations and surveillance operations aimed at drug activity in the target area. Prostitution-free zones and drug-free zones were employed to restrict previously convicted persons from entering specified geographical areas where problem activities were known to exist. Additionally, there was full-time police presence in the Weed and Seed neighborhoods.

Community Policing activities in the target area were directed by two community police officers assigned to work in the target area neighborhoods. This assignment included acting as members of the Neighborhood Support Team, a group that consisted of police, building, fire, and zoning code officials, and a civil compliance officer.

Seed activities that addressed prevention, intervention, treatment and neighborhood restoration focused on multiple issues. Educational and recreational youth activities were supervised by the Boys and Girls Club and by the Petersburg Police Athletic League (PPAL). Assistance with daycare costs was made available to qualified residents of the target area. In addition, monthly meetings were held with neighborhood residents. Finally, blight elimination, demolition activities, building repairs and community clean-up efforts served to revitalize the target area neighborhoods.

Description of the Petersburg Program – Third Year

For the third program year, funding was approved for the following activities:

- Overtime (1695 hours) for police officers to maintain current levels of community policing presence in the target area, and to support investigations, controlled buys and informant fees;
- Two community police officers assigned to work in the target area;
- A computer instructor and equipment for the PPAL program;
- PPAL Boxing Academy equipment and travel costs;
- PPAL rented space expenses;
- Demolition of blighted properties;
- Assistance with daycare costs;
- Community survey expenses; and
- Supplies for community meetings.

Weed and Community-Oriented Policing Activities

Weed strategies in Petersburg concentrated on community policing functions as well as sweep and checkpoint activities. Community police officers assigned to the target area organized most of the activities. These officers operated out of a building in the neighborhood used as a community substation that also housed the Petersburg Police Department's Bike Patrol and the Neighborhood Support Team. Officers attended regular community meetings in the target area and planned other special operations. Narcotic investigations and surveillance operations were accomplished through the Multi-Disciplinary Investigative Team which largely focused on drug trafficking and associated crimes. Additionally, the City implemented a Street Crimes Unit specifically to target the area.

The Weed and Seed officers collaborated in a multi-agency operation in the target area that led to the arrest of multiple drug traffickers. Other activities that contributed to the Weed strategy included: beat officers that met and talked with residents and business owners in the target area, enforcement of nuisance violations and code compliance, and use of a marked police department bus parked in the target area to increase perception of police presence and deter crime.

Other staff from the Petersburg Police Department worked to improve understanding between the police and the neighbors in the target area. The Crime Prevention Specialist and the School Safety Planner met with citizens to explain the concept of Community-Oriented Policing and the citizen's role in making their neighborhood a safer place to live.

Seed Activities³

Petersburg's Seed efforts concentrated on youth recreation and educational activities, daycare assistance and eradicating blight. A part-time Program Coordinator compensated with Weed and

³Reports on Petersburg's third year of Seed programming were submitted for only the first two quarters of the grant year. Therefore, Seed information reporting third-year activities reflect only those activities in the first six months of the grant year.

Seed funds organized the Boys and Girls Club activities. These activities included homework assistance, conflict resolution, computer skills training, cultural enrichment, and recreational activities. Approximately 20% of the children enrolled at the Boys and Girls Club were from the target area, and outreach efforts were made to recruit more target area youth. PPAL provided a computer skills course for children and teens and was piloting an adult computer skills course. PPAL also provided recreational activities to area youth including the addition of a Boxing Academy to its program. Boxing equipment and instruction were provided to interested youth, and transportation funds were provided to send participating youth to New York for the National Police Athletic League Olympic Junior Boxing tournament.

The Tabernacle Baptist Church Daycare program provided financial assistance for daycare costs to qualified families in the target area. To qualify, applicants were required to be either working or transitioning from welfare to work. In another Seed effort, the blight elimination efforts involved neighborhood clean-ups and the removal of derelict structures. Additional work that occurred in this area included the conversion of public housing to owner-occupied residential townhouses. The demolition of derelict structures and the conversion of public housing also received funding from other sources in addition to the Weed and Seed initiative.

Other activities that enhanced the Weed and Seed effort in the target area neighborhood included Operation Clean Sweep, which brought persons with assigned community service hours into the neighborhoods to help clean up the area. The Neighborhood Support Officer (part of the Neighborhood Support Team) assisted with this program by supervising the participants. Clean-up efforts included picking up litter, removing weeds, and repairing homes owned by elderly citizens.

Obstacles to Program Implementation

The Petersburg Weed effort did experience some obstacles to program implementation. During the third-year grant period, two community police officers assigned to the target area resigned from the department, and the Sergeant who acted as the Weed program coordinator was injured and out on disability. This left only two officers assigned to the target area for much of the third year. This reduction in staff affected the ability to deliver services and maintain previous levels of activity. Citizen buy-in has also been an ongoing problem for the Petersburg Seed program. Plans to create a Citizens Patrol program were never realized due to residents' lack of interest. Additionally, coordinators reported that some residents of the target area neighborhoods expressed their displeasure with police checkpoints and additional patrols, and were uncomfortable talking with officers in their neighborhoods.

Summary of Program Activities⁴

Petersburg's Weed and Seed program efforts focused on increased police presence through overtime patrol hours and full-time community police officers assigned to the target area. The Seed element highlighted removal of blighted properties from the target area and youth activities through PPAL.

⁴ Weed activities in Petersburg were not reported for April 2000; therefore, data reported include July 1999 through March 2000, May 2000, and June 2000.

During the third year of the Weed and Seed program in Petersburg, Weed funds supported an average of 6 part-time and full-time officers who worked an average of 535 hours in the target area per month. Over the span of the third grant year, 199 law enforcement special operations were conducted which resulted in 491 arrests, 13% of which were for drug violations. Additionally, 21 checkpoint operations were conducted which resulted in one DUI charge and 14 drug arrests.

During the third grant year, officers executed 6 search warrants in the target area. In addition, the region’s multi-jurisdictional task force conducted an operation that resulted in the arrest of 15 drug traffickers. Nuisance violations were also a focus of Petersburg’s Community Policing strategy in the target area. During the grant year, this effort resulted in over 90 inoperable vehicle citations and approximately 52 citations for decal violations.

Calls-for-service in the target area averaged 758 a month, comprising about 14% of the citywide total. Eighteen firearms were seized in the target area during the third grant year, which accounted for about 22% of the firearms seized citywide. A total of \$6,438 worth of illegal drugs was seized in the target area during the third grant year.

Over the span of the first six months of the third grant year, Petersburg’s Seed Program Administrator attended 2 community meetings and 7 neighborhood association meetings in the target area. During this same time frame, blight elimination efforts resulted in the demolition of 15 blighted structures. Program participation for Petersburg’s other Seed efforts is detailed in Table 8.

<p style="text-align: center;">Table 8 Seed Programs Participation (July 99 – Dec 99 only) Petersburg - Third Year</p>		
Program Name	Age Range of Participants	Number of Participants
PPAL	13 - 18	approximately 64
Petersburg Boys and Girls Club	6 - 18	approximately 52
Tabernacle Baptist Church Day Care	2 – 6	5 families

Arrest Statistics for the Petersburg Target Area

In analyzing Petersburg’s IBR offense and arrest data for the third year of Weed and Seed, no significant trends or patterns were discernable. The three most common types of arrests made in the Petersburg target area are displayed in Table 9.

<p style="text-align: center;">Table 9 Most Common Arrests in Target Area Petersburg - Third Year</p>	
Type	Number
Drug / Narcotic Violations *	155
Trespass	137
Simple Assault	106

* Includes drug equipment violation

The arrests made for these three offenses, drug / narcotic violations, trespass, and simple assault, represent 49% of all arrests made in the target area. Simple assaults made up 76% of all assaults in the target area. (See Appendix C for a breakdown of third-year IBR offense and arrest data for Petersburg’s target area.)

Summary Assessment by Local Weed and Seed Coordinators

At the end of the third year of the Weed and Seed program, program coordinators were asked their opinions about the grant activities they were most pleased with as well as those which did not fulfill expectations. Petersburg officials identified several different components of the Weed and Seed program with which they were particularly satisfied. The reduction in the number of abandoned and derelict structures and level of property rehabilitation that took place in the target area were noted as very positive developments. The elevated level of policing and higher number of arrests have reportedly increased the public’s confidence in the ability of police and citizens to improve the area’s quality of life.

However, some desired accomplishments were not realized. The Citizens Patrol program never became operational. Many of the residents in the area are elderly and reportedly did not want to get involved in such a program. Coordinators indicated that some residents feel that it is the sole responsibility of the police to prevent and control crime.

Continuation Plans

The community substation established in the Weed and Seed target area will remain operational. Area community police officers and the Neighborhood Support Team will continue to base operations from that location to maintain a police presence in the area. Neighborhood restoration efforts will also continue, as a rehabilitation district designation is currently under study for a part of the target area.

WINCHESTER

Description of the Community

Winchester is a small city (pop. 21,947) encompassing approximately nine square miles in the northwest region of Virginia and is located about 70 miles west of Washington D.C. Winchester is an education and employment center for the northwest region and has a daytime population that swells to 70,000. Winchester also has a seasonal workforce due to its large orchard operations.

Winchester's Weed and Seed target area covers just over 1/2 square mile and consists of three neighborhoods: North End, South End and Bellevue. These neighborhoods are in the city's center and lie along the busy Kent Street corridor. Bellview is home to a large and emergent Hispanic community.

Overview of Program Strategies

Winchester's Weed and Seed activities focused primarily on increased law enforcement and prosecution, greater interaction and understanding between police and residents, and targeted community services. Winchester's Weed and Seed program adapted its program structure to address some administrative problems that emerged during the first and second year. The overall program emphasis, however, remained consistent.

Suppression activities in Winchester emphasized increased enforcement through intensified foot, bicycle, and vehicle patrols in the target area neighborhoods. Traffic checkpoint operations were used as an enforcement technique and were sometimes accomplished with assistance from the Virginia State Police. In the first two years of the grant, funding was also made available to the Commonwealth Attorney's Office to enhance prosecution of Weed and Seed area offenders.

Winchester's Community Policing activities focused on increased interaction between police and residents. For example, the Residential Officer program provided assistance for officers to live in one of the target area neighborhoods. Winchester also had a Citizens Academy course for citizens who wanted to learn more about law enforcement. The Volunteers in Policing (VIP) program was an outgrowth of the Citizen's Academy. Additionally, the officers assigned to the Weed and Seed target area attended Neighborhood Association and Neighborhood Watch meetings in the target area neighborhoods. A residents' survey was also conducted in 1999 and 2000 to gauge attitudes about neighborhood crime and police / citizen relations.

Seed strategies focusing on prevention, intervention, treatment and neighborhood restoration covered many areas of service. Family-based services such as domestic violence workshops, family counseling and parenting classes were offered during the second grant year. The third-year Seed activities were offered as a Mini-Grant program where local groups and organizations applied for funds to provide community services. Funded programs emphasized youth education and recreation, scouting, Hispanic community outreach, and daycare tuition subsidies.

Description of the Winchester Program – Third Year

In the third year, funding was approved for the following activities:

- Salary and benefits for one police Sergeant to coordinate all police efforts on the Weed and Seed program,
- Overtime (485 hours) for police officers to maintain enforcement efforts in the target area neighborhoods,
- Rent subsidies and other supplies for four officers to participate in the Residential Officer program,
- Equipment, supplies, and clothing for the VIP program,
- Equipment and supplies to furnish a community meeting room, and
- Additional lighting for the target area neighborhoods as determined by a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) assessment.

Also, funds were made available to offer Mini-Grants to agencies and groups who provide services to residents of the target area neighborhoods.

Weed and Community-Oriented Policing Activities

Weed activities in Winchester's target area were coordinated by a grant-funded Sergeant at the Winchester Police Department. His responsibilities involved supervision and scheduling of enforcement and crime prevention activities in the Weed and Seed area, coordination of the Residential Officer program, planning and documentation of Weed and Seed meetings, and writing statistical and narrative reports. Activities in the target area focused on community-oriented policing, citizen involvement, crime prevention, and volunteerism. Enforcement operations were primarily accomplished through checkpoints and special patrols.

The Residential Officers initiative continued in the third year. For the first half of the grant year, there were five police officers living in the three target area neighborhoods. This number was reduced to four officers in December 1999 when one officer retired. These officers received a rent subsidy and were assigned marked police vehicles. The vehicles helped to increase police visibility in the target area. The residential officers worked to become important resources and trusted members of the neighborhood.

The VIP program continued to add new members to its ranks in the third year and participated in numerous events, handling many assignments which were formerly covered by sworn officers. This effort made sworn officers available for other assignments. The VIP group met monthly and volunteered for various assignments as needed. Some of the VIP activities included: conducting crime prevention activities, hosting recreational events, providing citizen's patrols for special events, conducting community surveys, and organizing community benefits.

The target area community survey conducted in the third grant year was a follow-up to the survey conducted in the previous year. The survey was designed to measure residents' fear of

crime and their thoughts about the police in their community. Overall, there were only slight changes in the results from the second grant year to the third grant year. The most significant change indicated a large increase in police visibility. Further, residents reported a strong increase in their familiarity with their neighbors and a slight increase in their fear of crime.

Other Weed activities that occurred in the target area included: Neighborhood Watch meetings, the Annual National Night Out event, a robbery prevention workshop conducted by police for taxi drivers, a multi-agency Public Safety fair, and a CPTED street lighting assessment.

Seed Activities

In the third year, Winchester organized the target area Seed activities as a Mini-Grant program. This structure allowed organizations to apply for funding to provide services to the target area. Five groups applied for and were awarded funds:

- Caretakers,
- Girl Scouts of Shawnee Council,
- Frederick County Schools / Northern Shenandoah Valley Adult Education English as a Second Language (ESL),
- Freemont Street Nursery, and
- Winchester Day Nursery.

The majority of activities awarded funding through the Mini-Grant program provided supervision, education and / or recreation to target area children and youth. The exception was the ESL program which specifically assisted Winchester's growing Hispanic community. Funding was also awarded to Winchester to hire a Neighborhood Development Coordinator. This person would be responsible for monitoring, organizing and providing technical assistance to the various Seed program providers.

Caretakers

Caretakers provided academic, social and recreational activities for youth in grades K – 12. Opportunities for field trips, discussion groups, and youth choir were also made available. Specific academic programs included Early Learning for children in grades K - 2, a program to reinforce basic skills such as reading, math, and writing; Academically Improving Minds (AIM), a homework assistance program for grades 3 and up; and Special Tutoring which provided one-on-one tutoring for students that needed help with particular subjects.

Girl Scouts

Girl Scouts of Shawnee Council planned to recruit girls from the South End neighborhood to form a new Girl Scout troop in the southern part of the target area. This neighborhood has a large Hispanic population so informational materials were produced in both Spanish and English. However, not enough interest was generated and no troop was formed.

Adult Education / ESL

Adult Education / ESL worked with Spanish-speaking residents to improve their proficiency in English and help expand their job skills. Grant funds provided the program with computer

equipment and a TV / VCR to be used for instruction and job-seeking tasks. Activities concentrated on two program goals: improving English skills and sharpening job skills. These goals were pursued through literacy and vocabulary workshops, first aid and CPR training, and employment referrals. Other activities included participating in community events and organizing area sports teams.

Freemont Street Nursery

Freemont Street Nursery provided assistance with daycare costs to qualified families who demonstrated financial need. These subsidies enabled parents to maintain employment or to seek employment. During the grant year, more assistance was provided due to surplus program funds. This enabled more families to receive daycare services at reduced or no cost through this program.

Winchester Day Nursery

Winchester Day Nursery originally planned to provide assistance with daycare costs to families who had a qualifying emergency, were temporarily unemployed, or who needed to reserve their child's enrollment in the nursery while the child was out due to extended illness or hospitalization. However, these types of situations did not occur frequently, and funds were not being used. Consequently, the qualifications for assistance were changed to accommodate families who demonstrated financial need and were striving to maintain or find employment.

State funds were also awarded to Winchester to hire a full-time Neighborhood Development Coordinator. This position would conduct needs assessments, develop neighborhood initiatives, and provide coordination between neighborhoods and various City departments and services. However, Winchester's City Council rejected establishing the position. The unused funds that were set aside for this position and for the Girl Scout troop were instead used to fund two other projects: production of a public service video to promote Hispanic cultural awareness and the revitalization of a park in the target area. Park revitalization included landscape improvements organized by private citizens and help from area Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts.

Obstacles to Program Implementation

The Winchester City Council's decision not to approve funds for the Neighborhood Development Coordinator position was a set back to the implementation of the Seed programs. The types of assistance that a Neighborhood Development Coordinator could provide may have enhanced the provision of services to the target area neighborhoods.

Sadly, a Winchester Police Department Sergeant was murdered while working in the target area on October 29, 1999. An event of this magnitude in a city as small as Winchester greatly disrupted the department's ability to conduct many routine procedures. Grant activities in the Weed and Seed target area occurred at a reduced level for a few weeks following this incident.

Summary of Program Activities

The Winchester Weed and Seed program highlighted community policing through its Residential Officer and VIP programs. Seed activities were conducted by local agencies who were awarded funds through a Mini-Grant program.

During the third year of the Weed and Seed program in Winchester, Weed funds supported an average of four full-time officers who each worked an average of 20 hours in the target area per week. Over the span of the final grant year, four checkpoint operations were conducted which resulted in a total of 28 traffic and DUI charges.

VIPs held five meetings during the grant year, added three new members, and ended the year with a total of 13 members. In addition, 14 Neighborhood Watch meetings were held among the three target area neighborhoods. One-time community policing events that were held during the grant year are cited in Table 10.

<p style="text-align: center;">Table 10 One-Time Community Policing Events Winchester - Third Year</p>	
Activity Description	Attended By
Annual National Night Out	400 citizen participants 17 community groups
Public Safety Fair	900 attendees 41 organizations
Robbery Prevention for Taxi Drivers	12
5 th Citizens Academy	14

Calls-for-service in the target area averaged 1,770 a month⁵, about 35% of the citywide total. Four firearms were seized in the target area during the third grant year, or about 24% of the firearms seized citywide. No data were available concerning the amount of illegal drugs that were seized in Winchester’s target area during the third grant year.

One of Winchester’s approved Mini-Grant programs and the Neighborhood Development Organizer position did not use any designated funds. As previously mentioned, these unspent funds were used to support two other projects in the target community. Program participation for Winchester’s four active Mini-Grant programs is detailed in Table 11.

⁵ This number includes traffic stops as well as citizen-initiated and officer-initiated calls.

Table 11
Seed Mini-Grant Programs Participation
Winchester - Third Year

Program Name	Age Range of Participants	Number of Participants
Caretakers	Grades K - 12	35 - 80 daily average
Adult Education / ESL	Adults	79 individuals from 30 + countries
Freemont Street Nursery	2 - 8	16
Winchester Day Nursery	infant - 3	23

In addition, Caretakers academic programs served between 80 - 100 kids during the school year. Enrollment for their summer youth program (Summer Madness) was up 156% over last year.

Arrest Statistics for the Winchester Target Area

In analyzing Winchester’s IBR offense and arrest data for the third year of Weed and Seed, no significant trends or patterns were found. The three most common types of arrests made in the Winchester target area are displayed in Table 12.

Table 12
Most Common Arrests in Target Area
Winchester - Third Year

Type	Number
Simple Assault	139
DUI	86
Liquor Law Violation	78

The arrests made for these three offenses, simple assault, DUI and liquor law violations, represent 21% of all arrests made in the target area. Simple assaults made up 91% of all assaults in the target area. (See Appendix C for the third year IBR offense and arrest data for Winchester’s target area.)

Summary Assessment by Local Weed and Seed Coordinators

At the end of the third year of the Weed and Seed program, program coordinators were asked their opinions about the grant activities they were most pleased with as well as those which did not fulfill expectations. Winchester officials identified several different elements of the Weed and Seed program with which they were particularly pleased. Winchester was very satisfied with the Residential Officers program and the relationship it has forged between the Police Department and the residents of the target area. The program has also reportedly led to the development of new partnerships between the neighborhoods and the public and private agencies that serve them. Additionally, the VIP program has helped to create a supportive relationship between citizens and police.

However, some desired accomplishments were not realized. The rejection of the Neighborhood Development Coordinator position by the City Council was noted as a disappointment, but there are indications the community may gain such a position in the near future. Also, coordinators suggested that the South End area could have used more encouragement and resources to establish Seed programs in their neighborhood. Instead, many of the programs were clustered in the North End area. Additionally, the Kent Street business owners should have been recruited to be more involved in the initiative.

Continuation Plans

Because the Residential Officers program was enthusiastically received by the community and valued by the police department, this initiative will continue. Funding for rent subsidies will be provided with City funds, and the program will expand citywide. Overtime funds will also be made available to maintain the additional enforcement operations in the target area and expand these operations to other areas of Winchester. The VIP program will also continue to operate with funding from the City.

All of the Seed program organizations were in existence prior to Weed and Seed and will continue to serve the target area in at least their pre-Weed and Seed capacities. Winchester's City Council has recently decided that a Neighborhood Development Coordinator position should be established. It has proposed establishing the position and is now going through the necessary procedures to add the position to the City's staff.

A memorial for the Sergeant killed in the line of duty is underway. The City bought property in the neighborhood to create a park. The park will be dedicated to Sergeant Richard Timbrook, and Winchester's new public safety building currently under construction will be named the Timbrook Public Safety Building.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implementation of the Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative has clearly taken a unique form in each evaluation site, and each locality has faced unique challenges in implementing the program at the local level. However, little information is currently available to determine the impact of local Weed and Seed program components. This section summarizes the evaluation findings and provides recommendations for future program development.

Discussion of Program Findings

By reviewing the broad program goals specified in the Weed and Seed grant guidelines, both common and unique aspects of local Weed and Seed programming emerge.

Goal 1

To develop a comprehensive, multi-agency strategy to eliminate violent crime, drug trafficking and drug-related crime from targeted high-crime neighborhoods.

With respect to Goal 1, each site has clearly attempted to implement a strategy to reduce crime in the target neighborhoods over the three-year funding cycle. Crime elimination activities have included an increased police presence in each target area and efforts to enhance community involvement with the police department. Each site implemented the Suppression Strategy by increased enforcement, investigations, and surveillance. All sites emphasized reduction of drug trafficking and drug-related offenses, and obtained assistance from existing local resources, such as drug task forces and the Virginia State Police. In fact, an examination of the most common arrest types across target areas suggested that drug / narcotic violations and simple assault were high emphasis offenses. Efforts to target these types of crime are very consistent with the intent of Goal 1.

Prosecution of target area offenders was mentioned as a distinct part of the Weed and Seed program effort in all localities, and is clearly a foundational component of the Suppression Strategy outlined in the program guidelines. However, over the course of the project, only one location requested additional resources to address the increased prosecutorial caseload that results from intensified enforcement efforts. Even in that locality, this effort was discontinued in the third program year.

Goal 2

To establish and sustain strong community commitment, through local government and private sector partnerships, to a safe environment, free of crime, for law-abiding citizens to live, work and raise a family.

Goal 2 addresses several aspects of Weed and Seed program activities. The Community-Oriented Policing Strategy was employed by all localities in numerous ways. All localities

increased patrols in the area, thereby increasing police visibility. Most localities made an effort to assign officers to specific parts of the target area on a regular basis, though some were more successful than others at maintaining specific officers in the target area. In the case of Winchester's Residential Officer program, officers actually became target area residents and housed their patrol cars on site.

Another notable effort involved creating collaborative relationships between police and the community. For example, target area officers regularly attended community meetings in each locality. Police officers were also used in needs assessment efforts in multiple sites. However, implementation has been difficult for certain types of community collaboration efforts. Target area involvement in Citizens' Patrols has been limited, and this component never became operational in Petersburg. Over the course of the project, Lynchburg has experienced some similar difficulties in increasing resident participation in some neighborhood committee activities.

All localities likewise engaged in the Neighborhood Restoration Strategy by increasing code enforcement efforts in the target areas. Code enforcement activities have reportedly improved the living conditions of many target area residents.

Goal 3

To help residents eliminate causes of crime within the community and stabilize the quality of life through viable employment, education, housing, economic development, recreation, treatment, crime prevention, victims services and community corrections initiatives.

Goal 3 emphasizes the application of the Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Strategy. This goal was addressed largely through various Seed programs at the Weed and Seed sites. The focus of these programs varied considerably across sites, though Seed program development was reportedly driven by local needs. One common element across programs was an emphasis on youth services. All localities had strong delinquency prevention / youth opportunity themes in their Seed activities. Most localities sought the assistance of area Boys and Girls Clubs or similar organizations that provide academic and recreational activities to youth in a positive environment. Other Seed activities that addressed this goal include, but are not limited to:

- Lynchburg's resident homeowner assistance programs;
- Norfolk's Youth Employment Program, which attempted to create employment opportunities for target area youth;
- Petersburg's daycare assistance program, which increased opportunities for target area residents to gain / maintain employment; and
- Winchester's Caretakers programs, which provided academic and recreational services for youth.

Goal 4

To enhance and maintain safe school environments through partnerships between law enforcement, education, private sector resource providers and social service agency providers.

Safety in the school environment, outlined in Goal 4, received very little attention throughout the Virginia Weed and Seed program. It may be arguable that the Seed emphasis on juvenile issues (including academic achievement programs) is addressing this problem, but there are clearly few programs that approach school safety directly. There were only two notable exceptions to this conclusion. Norfolk's Positive Confrontation Program addressed anger management and conflict resolution skills within the school environment, and school officials referred participants to the program. Additionally, Lynchburg Police assisted school administrators in drafting a crisis intervention plan for area schools. Otherwise, school safety issues received little consideration in the existing Seed program components. As noted earlier, this particular goal is not addressed in the federal Weed and Seed program philosophy.

Recommendations

The lack of appropriate data on the Weed and Seed program and its impacts precludes us from forming a definitive assessment of this program's long-term effects on target neighborhoods. However, local staff continue to be optimistic about the program, and report that the services are affecting target area residents in a number of positive ways. Although further research is needed to draw meaningful conclusions about this program, the preliminary findings may be useful to improve program administration and operations, both at the state and local level. Consequently, evaluators have developed several recommendations based on the qualitative and quantitative findings presented in this report. Although state funding for this program was discontinued in July 2000, most localities intend to continue their programming efforts in some capacity. Therefore, recommendations include guidance for Weed and Seed programs at the local level, as well as general suggestions for state planning of similar programs.

Foundational Issues

1. Local Weed and Seed programs should address problems with the lack of program "buy-in" and support of Weed and Seed activities by area residents. Community involvement should occur early in the process, whenever possible.

Difficulties with resident "buy-in" have affected these programs in several ways. The philosophy underlying the Weed and Seed program requires that the community be mobilized to respond to public safety needs. However, law enforcement officials in several of the communities repeatedly indicated that the residents "expect the police to do everything." These problems are evident in the difficulties Lynchburg has experienced in increasing membership in Neighborhood Councils. In addition, Petersburg struggled with establishing Citizens Patrols. One possible explanation for this lack of resident buy-in is that residents of high-crime areas may be skeptical of government-funded initiatives, which they perceive as coming and going in their neighborhoods with little overall impact. Feedback from at least one site early in the evaluation suggested this as a problem. Consequently, this perceived lack of government commitment to long-term solutions may result in a lack of citizen commitment and involvement.

However, the Weed and Seed initiative includes components designed to increase resident involvement. Both the Community Policing and the Seed components are intended to increase community participation and individual responsibilities. Although data are not available to thoroughly assess the level of resident involvement in the Weed and Seed areas, it seems clear that resident buy-in has been difficult to achieve for certain program components, such as citizen involvement in committees, councils and patrols and parental involvement in youth programs. Preliminary evaluation findings do suggest that a stronger neighborhood commitment to Weed and Seed initiatives may produce more active Seed components and more collaborative Weed efforts. In addition, findings from the National Evaluation of Weed and Seed indicate that residents should be involved in program planning early in the process to reduce resistance and increase cooperation (NIJ, 1999b). Therefore, future efforts to increase community buy-in should be seen as integral to program success.

2. Emphasis on the prosecutorial element of Weed and Seed should be increased.

The Weed component in three of the program sites did not include any grant-funded prosecutorial support over the entire three-year grant period. The only program which used Weed and Seed funds to provide prosecutorial support removed this component in the third year. Increased enforcement without increased resources to prosecute, adjudicate, and sentence offenders seems incompatible with the grant's stated Suppression Strategy. Specifically, these activities should "consist primarily of enforcement, adjudication, prosecution, and supervision activities designed to target, apprehend, and incapacitate violent street criminals who terrorize neighborhoods and account for a disproportionate percentage of criminal activity" (DCJS, 1997, 1998, 1999b). In addition, failure to pursue aggressive prosecution may send the message to communities that the program philosophy is lenient. Overall, the prosecutorial aspect seems largely neglected in the state-funded programs. Failure to support Weed activities with adjudication and prosecution resources has likewise been noted as a problem in the National Evaluation of Weed and Seed (NIJ, 1999b; Roehl, et al., 1996).

3. Needs assessment techniques for the Seed program component should be improved to address target area needs more directly.

Although each locality engaged in residential surveys as a part of its initial program activities, most survey efforts neglected to capitalize on the opportunity to identify residents' needs, particularly with respect to planning Seed services. In addition, most sites discontinued the survey efforts in subsequent program years. While each site used crime offense and arrest statistics to support the focus of their Weed activities, program staff generally had difficulties explaining how the Seed activities were determined. Only the Lynchburg program seemed to engage in a needs assessment process in the target area to plan the Seed program component. Other localities may have used citywide assessments to plan the programs; however, generalized assessments are not necessarily appropriate to guide neighborhood-specific programming. In addition, needs assessment activities should be performed regularly to identify changes in needs that require programming modifications.

It is critical for neighborhoods to adequately assess resident needs when planning to provide localized services. Otherwise, desired impacts may not occur because actual needs have not

been addressed. Needs assessments should also assist in identifying appropriate boundaries for intervention. By identifying areas that are most in need, services can be concentrated in an optimal manner. Using needs assessments to pinpoint the most favorable target area is also indicated by findings from the National Evaluation, which clarifies the importance of narrowly defining the target population. The needs assessment process should involve not only area agencies, but also the community itself. These efforts are likely to encourage resident buy-in as well.

4. Weed and Seed program communities should facilitate strong leadership and interagency cooperation. Key individuals need to be actively involved and publicly supportive of the initiative.

According to the National Evaluation of Weed and Seed, the support of public officials support is a critical element to program success (NIJ, 1999b). Key individuals in law enforcement, city government, and the prosecutor's office (as well as community leaders and program staff) should display strong leadership, support, and enthusiasm for the initiative, and engage in political collaboration. To further encourage public support, programs should be publicized regularly to raise community awareness and interest. Most program-related publicizing took place at the beginning of the first grant year, but did not continue throughout the three year program.

5. Private sector involvement is important to a program's long-term success.

Government funding for programs is often short-term; therefore, supporting resources should be identified to continue these efforts after government funds are terminated. It is important to involve the private sector in the planning stages of the program for the same reasons it is important to involve the residents: creating buy-in and investment. The private sector can provide unique support in revitalizing communities by providing volunteer efforts, donations, and employment opportunities. The National Evaluation of Weed and Seed revealed that private sector investment, though very important to program success, was often neglected (NIJ, 1999b). In general, Virginia's Weed and Seed programs likewise gave this issue very little attention.

Program Structure

6. Each local Weed and Seed program should employ a Program Coordinator who is dedicated to coordination tasks.

The grant objectives of both the Virginia and federal Weed and Seed initiatives emphasize the importance of coordinating the various Weed and Seed programs and activities. The Community-Oriented Policing Strategy highlights the importance of developing collaborative relationships between police and community residents. Over the course of the evaluation project, several Weed and Seed localities have experienced difficulties because they lack resources to adequately maintain these coordination duties, particularly with reporting program activities / outcomes and oversight of sub-contracting agencies. In some instances, existing full-time staff have been charged with these additional duties, significantly compromising the ability to effectively accomplish the coordination function. In the Winchester site, the Coordinator position was requested in the third-year grant application but was cut at the local level from the

state-approved budget. This program cited this problem as a significant hindrance to its overall success.

Preliminary findings of this evaluation indicate that coordination of Weed and Seed programs and activities is necessary and should be done by a person who can dedicate at least half-time work to this function. The Program Coordinator should be responsible for coordinating and monitoring various activities of the local Weed and Seed program; encouraging citizen involvement; informing the locality and target areas of program-related activities and resources; and coordinating with program partners such as the media, prosecutor's offices, and city government. The Program Coordinator could also improve the development of various partnerships in the localities.

General Strategies for Planning and Administering Similar Programs

7. Programs that incorporate significant administrative and programmatic complexity, such as Weed and Seed, should be carefully planned and monitored to maximize the potential for program impact.

Collaborative community-based program models, such as Weed and Seed, are organizationally complex due to their multi-faceted structures. Fundamental program elements that involve community participation and coordinated service delivery require sufficient time to develop. Therefore, similar programs should be carefully constructed by considering the broad lessons learned during the Weed and Seed program, as described below.

Program Planning and Development

Development of the Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative was accomplished very quickly. Both the administering agency and local grantees were required to develop program specifications within very short time frames. Such limited planning time may have contributed to some of the difficulties encountered over the three-year grant period, such as insufficient resident buy-in. In the future, adequate time should be allocated prior to program onset to allow the administering agency and localities to develop thoughtful and comprehensive program plans.

Further, program designs that are based on existing models should take care to maintain program integrity. The Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative, while modeled after the federal Weed and Seed program, deviated from the federal model in at least one significant way. The Virginia Initiative's fourth goal, which specifically addresses school safety, was not highlighted in the federal model. Instead, the federal model contained a goal to address gang activity, which was not replicated in the Virginia Initiative guidelines. Given these differences, it is unclear whether it is reasonable to expect the Virginia model to produce effects similar to the federal program. Furthermore, Virginia's school safety goal was largely disregarded in the local program designs. Only one site included any programming that directly addressed school safety. Because this goal was basically ignored, state and local program administrators should review its compatibility with the other major principles of Weed and Seed. Incongruous program goals should be avoided in order to maintain program focus and concentrate resources effectively.

A comprehensive program plan should also include development of evaluation and reporting procedures. These elements should be discussed in the program's guidelines and be in place prior to program implementation. To assess program impacts, program administrators should require evaluation-relevant reporting and appropriate data collection from all grant recipients in these types of programs. In addition, evaluation efforts should be initiated prior to program implementation whenever possible.

Local Program Design and Accountability

Applicants for grant-funded programs should be required to submit a plan describing how they will measure the impact of their activities. The recipients of the Virginia Weed and Seed awards were required to have measurable goals and objectives, but were not required to address program outcomes. Consequently, grantees were not held accountable for producing desired program impacts and not required to explain the outcomes that their programs intended to produce. Localities that implement similar programs should seek technical assistance to establish outcome-based evaluation measures. State-funded grant programs should also be accountable for program outcomes rather than program implementation alone.

Additionally, collaborative community-based programs should be required to show evidence of community buy-in and cooperation or, at minimum, a detailed plan describing how it will be attained. According to the National Evaluation of Weed and Seed, these are essential elements in this type of program (NIJ, 1999b). If absent, the program has little chance of achieving its objectives. In this study, the localities that fostered community input and enthusiasm and who actively pursued citizen participation achieved their goals more readily than those who made little effort.

Further, program administrators and local programs should ensure partner and sub-grantee accountability. This problem emerged in our study when it was learned that some sub-grantees were not documenting their activities, thereby impairing the grantees' ability to fulfill their reporting requirements. Guideline and award conditions should clarify that localities that choose to sub-contract for services will be responsible for the sub-grantees compliance with grant requirements. In addition, program partners should likewise be responsible for complying with the grant requirements.

Maintaining Program Consistency and Continuity

Over the three-year grant period, several programs in our study experienced difficulties in implementing selected program components. Although funding was awarded to continue these efforts, some programs seemed to need assistance gathering local support for some program components. To justify additional funding for faltering program components, grantees should be required to document implementation problems and develop problem-solving steps to improve progress. In addition, state program administrators should seek sources of training and technical assistance to aid localities in these situations. For example, training could be provided to grantees in the development and advancement of community partnerships.

Finally, state program administrators and local officials should ensure that program services be delivered without interruption from year to year. During the Weed and Seed program, delayed decisions to renew the program for the second year reportedly led to decreased public support and interruptions in service delivery. Consequently, the intensive enforcement aspect was disrupted, which reportedly led to losses of gained impact. To minimize these problems, decisions regarding continued funding should be made well in advance of application deadlines. Similar efforts should be made by local government officials to promptly approve funding for continued programs to avoid program interruption.

VIII. SUMMARY

Overall, the Weed and Seed program model's strength is its ability to adapt to an individual community's needs and resources. With appropriate input, planning and monitoring, the program is able to provide services in many divergent areas, which ideally creates a healthier and safer community. As noted throughout this report, such a variety of services and implementation strategies were put into practice in each Virginia Weed and Seed site.

The Weed and Seed program does, however, present numerous challenges to effective program evaluation. Program variation, while valuable to address local needs, also makes cross-site evaluation problematic. Although the program is generally popular within the communities in which it operates, the lack of clear outcome objectives and appropriate outcome data inhibits the ability to effectively assess the program's impact.

The recommendations made in this report are offered to guide on-going local efforts in Weed and Seed and in similar collaborative community-based programs. These recommendations may also provide guidance in planning and evaluation of such programs in the future.

IX. REFERENCES

Delaware Statistical Analysis Center. (1998). City of Wilmington Operation Weed and Seed 1992 to 1996: An Evaluation. Dover, DE: Delaware Statistical Analysis Center.

Executive Office for Weed and Seed. (2000a). Executive Office for Weed and Seed's Homepage. (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/eows/)

Executive Office for Weed and Seed. (2000b). Weed and Seed Fiscal Year 2000 Program Guide and Application Kit. (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/eows/competitivesol/fy2000cs.txt)

Hanna, D. G. (1993). The Springfield Weed and Seed Initiative: A Process Description and Evaluation. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Authority.

National Institute of Justice. (1999a). National Evaluation of Weed and Seed. NCJ-175685). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice. (1999b). National Evaluation of Weed and Seed: Cross-Site Analysis. (NCJ-176358). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice. (1999c). National Evaluation of Weed and Seed: Pittsburgh Case Study. (NCJ-175699). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Roehl, J.A., Huitt, R., Wycoff, M.A., Pate, A., Rebovich, D., & Coyle, K. (1996). National process evaluation of Operation Weed and Seed (NCJ 161624). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (1997). Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative, Program Guidelines and Application Materials Fiscal Year 1997-1998. Richmond, VA: DCJS.

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (1998). Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative, Program Guidelines and Application Materials Fiscal Year 1998-1999. Richmond, VA: DCJS.

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (1999a). Evaluation of Virginia's Weed and Seed Initiative. Richmond, VA: DCJS.

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (1999b). Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative, Program Guidelines and Application Materials Fiscal Year 1999-2000. Richmond, VA: DCJS.

X. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Evaluation project staff would like to acknowledge the assistance of local Weed and Seed staff, program directors, program administrators, program coordinators, and DCJS staff in the preparation of this report on the third and final year of the Virginia Weed and Seed Initiative.

Lynchburg

Thomas Doss	Lynchburg Police Department
Dierdre Glover	Department of Human Services / Youth & Prevention Services
Tamara Rosser	Department of Human Services / Youth & Prevention Services
Lt. Michael T. Staley	Lynchburg Police Department
Capt. H. Leon Thomas	Lynchburg Police Department

Norfolk

Lt. Ron Ashley	Norfolk Police Department
William (Tommy) Old	Norfolk Police Department / Crime Analysis
Martha M. Raiss	Norfolk Department of City Planning & Code Administration

Petersburg

Officer Joseph Bucka	Petersburg Police Department
Kim Getchell	Petersburg Police Department / Crime Analysis
Major Morris Jones	Interim Chief / Petersburg Police Department
Leonard A. Muse	City of Petersburg / Director of Planning / CD
Sgt. Delores Randolph	Petersburg Police Department

Winchester

Timothy Alley	City of Winchester
Thandeka Cummings	Winchester Police Department
Sgt. Robert Gaither	Winchester Police Department
Paul Gealy	Winchester Police Department
Lt. William Griffith	Winchester Police Department
Rhonda Hendley	Caretakers
Clowe C. Nicholson	City of Winchester

Department of Criminal Justice Services

Joyce Bradford	Frank Johnstone	Tim Paul
Lisa Catlett-Price	Elizabeth Mancano	Janice Waddy
Katharina Cron	Joseph Marshall	Sandra Wright
Bill Dodd	Jim McDonough	Tammy Wyrick

XI. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Item 449

The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the impact of "Weed and Seed" programs funded to date. The review shall give particular attention to the longitudinal effect of the program in reducing the overall rates of crime in the jurisdictions where the program has been implemented. An interim report shall be presented to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by October 15, 1998, with a final report by July 1, 1999.

APPENDIX B

I. Offense Data

IBR data are to be submitted monthly. Data should reflect offenses that occurred during the calendar month.

IBR data are requested for the Weed and Seed **TARGET AREA** only.

GROUP	IBR CODE	OFFENSE DESCRIPTION	OFFENSES	ARRESTS
A	9	Homicide Offenses	-----	-----
A	9 A	Murder / Non-Negligent Manslaughter		
A	9 B	Negligent Manslaughter		
A	9 C	Justifiable Homicide		
A	100	Kidnapping / Abduction		
A	11	Sex Offenses, Forcible	-----	-----
A	11 A	Forcible Rape		
A	11 B	Forcible Sodomy		
A	11 C	Sexual Assault with an Object		
A	11 D	Forcible Fondling		
A	120	Robbery		
A	13	Assault Offenses	-----	-----
A	13 A	Aggravated Assault		
A	13 B	Simple Assault		
A	13 C	Intimidation		
A	200	Arson		
A	210	Extortion / Blackmail		
A	220	Burglary / Breaking & Entering		
A	23	Larceny / Theft Offenses	-----	-----
A	23 A	Pocket-Picking		
A	23 B	Purse Snatching		
A	23 C	Shoplifting		
A	23 D	Theft from a Building		
A	23 E	Theft from a Coin-Op. Machine or Device		
A	23 F	Theft from Motor Vehicle		
A	23 G	Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts / Accessories		
A	23 H	All Other Larceny		
A	240	Motor Vehicle Theft		
A	250	Counterfeiting / Forgery		
A	26	Fraud Offenses	-----	-----
A	26 A	False Pretenses / Swindle / Confidence Game		
A	26 B	Credit Card / ATM /		
A	26 C	Impersonation		
A	26 D	Welfare Fraud		
A	26 E	Wire Fraud		

GROUP	IBR CODE	OFFENSE DESCRIPTION	# OF OFFENSES	# OF ARRESTS
A	270	Embezzlement		
A	280	Stolen Property Offenses		
A	290	Destruction / Damage / Vandalism		
A	35	Drug / Narcotic Offenses	-----	-----
A	35 A	Drug / Narcotic Violations		
A	35 B	Drug Equipment Violations		
A	36	Sex Offenses, Non-forcible	-----	-----
A	36 A	Incest		
A	36 B	Statutory Rape		
A	370	Pornography / Obscene Material		
A	39	Gambling Offenses	-----	-----
A	39 A	Betting / Wagering		
A	39 B	Operating / Promoting / Assisting		
A	39 C	Gambling Equipment Violations		
A	39 D	Sports Tampering		
A	40	Prostitution Offenses	-----	-----
A	40 A	Prostitution		
A	40 B	Assisting or Promoting		
A	510	Bribery		
A	520	Weapon Law Violations		
B	90 A	Bad Checks		
B	90 B	Curfew / Loitering / Vagrancy Violations		
B	90 C	Disorderly Conduct		
B	90 D	DUI		
B	90 E	Drunkenness		
B	90 F	Family Offenses, Non-Violent		
B	90 G	Liquor Law Violations		
B	90 H	Peeping Tom		
B	90 I	Runaway		
B	90 J	Trespass of Real Property		
B	90 Z	All Other Offenses		

II. Supplemental Data

These data are to be submitted monthly. Data should reflect occurrences during the calendar monthly.

Hours of police presence IN TARGET AREA ONLY	Target area
# of officers funded with W/S funds (include part-time and full-time officers)	
# of hours of police presence funded with W/S funds (include hours for part-time and full-time officers)	
# of officers <u>NOT funded</u> with W/S funds (include part-time and full-time officers)	
# of hours of police presence <u>NOT funded</u> with W/S funds (include hours for part-time and full-time officers)	

Sweeps IN TARGET AREA ONLY	Target area
# of sweeps	
Total # of arrests made as a result of sweeps	
# of arrests that were drug-related	

Check points SERVING THE TARGET AREA	Target area
Total # of check points	
# of DUI charges made as a result of check points	
# of drug arrests made as a result of check points	

General	Target area	City-wide
Number of calls-for-service		
Number of firearms seized		

Please provide “quantity of drugs seized” data in either weight or street value.

Quantity of drugs seized (by type)	Quantity by <i>weight</i> in grams		Quantity by <i>street value</i> * in \$	
	Target area	City-wide	Target area	City-wide
Opium, Cocaine and Derivatives	g.	g.	\$	\$
Marijuana	g.	g.	\$	\$
Synthetic Narcotics	g.	g.	\$	\$
Other Dangerous Non-Narcotics	g.	g.	\$	\$

*If you provided street value data, explain how your agency calculates the “street value” figure for drugs seized.

III. Narrative Form A - Weed Activities

Narrative Form A is to be submitted quarterly. Information should reflect events and activities that have occurred during the reporting quarter. You may add copies of rosters, reports, handouts, etc. to this report when necessary to help explain or illustrate the information requested for the narrative report.

Report information about **grant-funded Weed activities that serve the target area** as outlined below.

1. ACTIVITIES

List and describe the specific Weed activities and Community Policing activities that occurred during this report period. Explain the roles of grant-funded personnel in relationship to the activities (enforcement, community policing officers, prosecutors, investigators, etc.). Please identify those Weed activities in the target area which are funded with Weed and Seed funds.

2. CHECKPOINTS, SWEEPS, SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Describe the nature of any checkpoints, sweeps, or special activities / patrols during the report period and the impact of these activities, if known (e.g. number and types of arrests from these activities, etc.). Please indicate whether these activities were conducted solely by W/S funded personnel or if non-W/S funded personnel assisted.

3. COLLABORATIVE SUPPORT

Discuss any collaborative support during the report period that was provided by the State Police or other entities in conducting Weed activities.

4. SUPPLEMENTING EXISTING EFFORTS

Illustrate how Weed activities during the report period supplemented previous or existing efforts in the target area or surrounding community.

5. SIGNIFICANT PROGRAM CHANGES

Describe any significant program changes in Weed activities since last quarter and explain reasons for changes.

6. PROGRAM OBSTACLES

Explain / describe obstacles to program implementation or service delivery which were encountered during this report.

III. Narrative Form B - Seed Activities

Narrative Form B is to be submitted quarterly. Information should reflect events and activities that have occurred during the reporting quarter. You may add copies of rosters, reports, handouts, etc. to this report when necessary to help explain or illustrate the information requested for the narrative report.

Report information about **grant-funded Seed activities that serve the target area** as outlined below.

1. ACTIVITIES

List and describe all Seed activities during the report time frame. Include the name and service provider for each program. Explain the roles of any grant-funded personnel in relationship to the activities. Please describe only those Seed activities in the target area that are funded with Weed and Seed funds.

2. TIME FRAME

Provide the time frame in which each Seed program / activity was operational during this quarter. What is the length of time that a program participant is expected to spend in each program? (e.g., Is the program a 10-week curriculum or a one-day event?)

3. PARTICIPANTS

Describe the participants in each of this quarter's operational programs. What population does each program target? How often did they participate? Generally describe those who actively participated in each program. How many people participated in each program? How many in each program reside in the target area?

4. COLLABORATIVE SUPPORT

Review any collaborative support during the report period that was provided by other agencies or organizations in conducting Seed activities.

5. SUPPLEMENTING EXISTING EFFORTS

Illustrate how Seed activities supplemented previous or existing efforts in the target area or surrounding community.

6. SIGNIFICANT PROGRAM CHANGES

Describe any significant program changes in Seed activities since last quarter and explain reason for changes.

7. PROGRAM OBSTACLES

Explain / describe obstacles to program implementation or service delivery which were encountered during this report period.

APPENDIX C

Reported IBR Offenses and Arrests in Weed and Seed Target Areas

July 1999 through June 2000

By Locality

GLOSSARY OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES AS COMBINED IN APPENDIX C TABLES

Drug / narcotic offenses

Drug / narcotic violations, drug equipment violations

Forcible sex offenses

Forcible rape, forcible sodomy, sexual assault with an object, forcible fondling

Fraud

False pretenses / swindle / confidence game, credit card / automated teller machine, impersonation, welfare fraud, wire fraud

Gambling offenses

Betting / wagering, operating / promoting / assisting, gambling equipment, sports tampering

Larceny

Theft from building, theft from coin-operated machine or device, theft from motor vehicle, theft of motor vehicle parts or accessories, all other larceny

Nonforcible sex offenses

Incest, statutory rape

Prostitution offenses

Prostitution, assisting or promoting prostitution

**IBR OFFENSES
LYNCHBURG
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	0	1	0	0	1
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	1	1	0	2	4
Forcible sex offenses	2	1	1	0	4
Robbery	3	6	7	1	17
Aggravated assault	9	15	10	10	44
Simple assault	54	50	49	48	201
Intimidation	0	0	4	5	9
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	69	74	71	66	280
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	0	1	1
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	11	13	11	4	39
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	1	0	0	1
Shoplifting	1	0	1	0	2
Larceny - other	67	46	31	23	167
Motor vehicle theft	12	6	3	1	22
Counterfeiting/Forgery	2	3	0	0	5
Fraud	1	1	2	4	8
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen property	10	2	0	0	12
Damage/Vandalism	49	33	13	16	111
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	153	105	61	49	368
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	0	0	2	2	4
Drug/narcotic offenses	34	53	38	45	170
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	0	1	0	3	4
Prostitution offenses	2	4	0	2	8
Weapon law violations	7	11	6	6	30
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly conduct	3	0	5	2	10
Driving under the influence	16	13	14	17	60
Drunkenness	1	1	0	0	2
Family offenses, nonviolent	0	1	5	4	10
Liquor law violations	1	0	2	0	3
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	6	2	0	5	13
All other offenses (except traffic)	13	41	30	26	110
Total Other Crimes	83	127	102	112	424
TOTAL OFFENSES	305	306	234	227	1,072

**IBR ARRESTS
LYNCHBURG
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	0	1	0	0	1
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	0	0	0	1	1
Forcible sex offenses	1	0	0	0	1
Robbery	1	0	3	0	4
Aggravated assault	5	6	7	6	24
Simple assault	33	18	29	17	97
Intimidation	0	0	0	1	1
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	40	25	39	25	129
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	0	0	0
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	1	2	4	0	7
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	1	0	0	1
Shoplifting	0	0	1	0	1
Larceny - other	3	6	3	1	13
Motor vehicle theft	4	2	0	0	6
Counterfeiting/Forgery	2	3	0	0	5
Fraud	1	1	1	3	6
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen property	0	1	0	0	1
Damage/Vandalism	4	4	6	2	16
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	15	20	15	6	56
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	0	0	2	2	4
Drug/narcotic offenses	32	52	37	42	163
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	0	1	0	3	4
Prostitution offenses	1	4	0	2	7
Weapon law violations	5	10	5	5	25
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly conduct	3	0	5	2	10
Driving under the influence	16	13	14	17	60
Drunkenness	1	1	0	0	2
Family offenses, nonviolent	0	0	1	2	3
Liquor law violations	1	0	2	0	3
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	6	2	0	2	10
All other offenses (except traffic)	11	20	18	15	64
Total Other Crimes	76	103	84	92	355
TOTAL ARRESTS	131	148	138	123	540

**IBR OFFENSES
NORFOLK
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	1	1	1	0	3
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	2	0	1	2	5
Forcible sex offenses	6	3	2	5	16
Robbery	10	10	6	8	34
Aggravated assault	14	6	8	10	38
Simple assault	26	16	21	34	97
Intimidation	1	1	0	2	4
Nonforcible sex offense	0	1	0	0	1
Total Crimes Against the Person	60	38	39	61	198
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	0	0	0
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	27	18	26	25	96
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	1	0	0	0	1
Shoplifting	6	0	1	0	7
Larceny - other	85	57	45	50	237
Motor vehicle theft	27	19	20	29	95
Counterfeiting/Forgery	0	1	0	0	1
Fraud	2	0	0	0	2
Embezzlement	0	1	0	0	1
Stolen property	6	0	1	0	7
Damage/Vandalism	27	28	28	43	126
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	181	124	121	147	573
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	1	0	0	0	1
Drug/narcotic offenses	17	14	9	21	61
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	1	0	0	0	1
Prostitution offenses	0	0	0	2	2
Weapon law violations	2	1	4	2	9
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly conduct	0	0	0	0	0
Driving under the influence	0	0	2	2	4
Drunkenness	1	0	0	1	2
Family offenses, nonviolent	0	0	0	0	0
Liquor law violations	0	0	0	0	0
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	16	0	0	0	16
All other offenses (except traffic)	46	24	39	60	169
Total Other Crimes	84	39	54	88	265
TOTAL OFFENSES	325	201	214	296	1,036

**IBR ARRESTS
NORFOLK
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	1	1	3	0	5
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	0	0	1	0	1
Forcible sex offenses	1	1	0	1	3
Robbery	1	4	0	0	5
Aggravated assault	4	2	1	3	10
Simple assault	2	2	17	19	40
Intimidation	0	0	0	0	0
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	9	10	22	23	64
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	0	0	0
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	0	6	0	8	14
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	0	0	0	0
Shoplifting	0	0	0	0	0
Larceny - other	2	5	5	13	25
Motor vehicle theft	8	4	1	1	14
Counterfeiting/Forgery	3	1	0	0	4
Fraud	0	1	0	1	2
Embezzlement	1	0	0	0	1
Stolen property	6	0	1	0	7
Damage/Vandalism	0	0	1	3	4
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	20	17	8	26	71
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	3	0	1	0	4
Drug/narcotic offenses	23	25	30	35	113
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	3	0	0	2	5
Prostitution offenses	0	3	0	1	4
Weapon law violations	5	1	6	3	15
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	6	1	2	0	9
Disorderly conduct	7	0	3	9	19
Driving under the influence	1	2	4	5	12
Drunkenness	6	6	12	10	34
Family offenses, nonviolent	0	0	0	0	0
Liquor law violations	0	2	14	9	25
Peeping Tom	4	0	0	0	4
Trespass to real property	29	30	17	12	88
All other offenses (except traffic)	60	75	61	56	252
Total Other Crimes	147	145	150	142	584
TOTAL ARRESTS	176	172	180	191	719

**IBR OFFENSES
PETERSBURG
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	0	0	0	3	3
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	0	0	0	0	0
Forcible sex offenses	1	2	2	2	7
Robbery	7	6	4	7	24
Aggravated assault	13	6	5	13	37
Simple assault	39	36	29	37	141
Intimidation	9	2	4	4	19
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	69	52	44	66	231
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	1	0	1
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	15	15	17	22	69
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	0	0	0	0
Shoplifting	0	0	0	0	0
Larceny - other	50	47	24	58	179
Motor vehicle theft	13	21	8	5	47
Counterfeiting/Forgery	1	0	0	12	13
Fraud	0	6	1	0	7
Embezzlement	0	0	1	0	1
Stolen property	0	3	2	6	11
Damage/Vandalism	28	28	33	41	130
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	107	120	87	144	458
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	0	0	0	0	0
Drug/narcotic offenses	38	36	32	27	133
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	0	0	0	3	3
Prostitution offenses	0	0	0	0	0
Weapon law violations	5	6	7	4	22
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	3	1	1	0	5
Disorderly conduct	13	5	1	6	25
Driving under the influence	1	3	1	0	5
Drunkenness	8	5	2	5	20
Family offenses, nonviolent	2	0	1	0	3
Liquor law violations	3	2	2	1	8
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	34	26	20	18	98
All other offenses (except traffic)	134	105	81	89	409
Total Other Crimes	241	189	148	153	731
TOTAL OFFENSES	417	361	279	363	1,420

**IBR ARRESTS
PETERSBURG
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	0	0	0	3	3
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	0	0	0	0	0
Forcible sex offenses	1	0	3	1	5
Robbery	1	3	0	3	7
Aggravated assault	3	8	3	11	25
Simple assault	34	24	21	27	106
Intimidation	2	3	2	2	9
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	41	38	29	47	155
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	1	0	1
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	1	2	3	1	7
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	0	0	0	0
Shoplifting	0	0	0	0	0
Larceny - other	5	4	2	0	11
Motor vehicle theft	1	2	1	1	5
Counterfeiting/Forgery	1	9	2	0	12
Fraud	0	0	0	0	0
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen property	7	4	1	0	12
Damage/Vandalism	4	4	5	8	21
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	19	25	15	10	69
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	1	0	0	2	3
Drug/narcotic offenses	42	39	44	30	155
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	0	0	0	1	1
Prostitution offenses	0	0	0	0	0
Weapon law violations	4	6	6	2	18
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	4	3	0	0	7
Disorderly conduct	18	13	1	7	39
Driving under the influence	11	5	3	2	21
Drunkenness	6	7	6	8	27
Family offenses, nonviolent	6	0	0	0	6
Liquor law violations	10	20	29	12	71
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	43	33	35	26	137
All other offenses (except traffic)	16	35	31	18	100
Total Other Crimes	161	161	155	108	585
TOTAL ARRESTS	221	224	199	165	809

**IBR OFFENSES
WINCHESTER
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	0	2	0	0	2
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	3	1	0	0	4
Forcible sex offenses	4	2	2	1	9
Robbery	2	1	2	5	10
Aggravated assault	4	6	7	3	20
Simple assault	73	53	81	77	284
Intimidation	1	0	0	0	1
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	87	65	92	86	330
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	0	1	1
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	14	19	25	19	77
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	0	0	0	0
Shoplifting	6	1	1	3	11
Larceny - other	65	50	71	64	250
Motor vehicle theft	1	2	3	5	11
Counterfeiting/Forgery	5	2	1	4	12
Fraud	4	0	4	5	13
Embezzlement	0	1	0	1	2
Stolen property	2	0	1	0	3
Damage/Vandalism	40	37	50	56	183
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	137	112	156	158	563
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	1	2	0	0	3
Drug/narcotic offenses	21	19	26	49	115
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution offenses	1	0	0	0	1
Weapon law violations	7	4	5	4	20
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly conduct	15	20	31	45	111
Driving under the influence	6	2	1	7	16
Drunkenness	6	11	8	17	42
Family offenses, nonviolent	17	17	24	26	84
Liquor law violations	4	3	3	12	22
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	2	1	0	3	6
All other offenses (except traffic)	93	80	74	135	382
Total Other Crimes	173	159	172	298	802
TOTAL OFFENSES	397	336	420	542	1,695

**IBR ARRESTS
WINCHESTER
JULY 1999 THROUGH JUNE 2000**

Offense Description	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Fourth Quarter	Total: Third Year
Crimes Against The Person					
Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter	0	2	0	0	2
Manslaughter by negligence	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping/Abduction	1	1	0	0	2
Forcible sex offenses	1	0	0	0	1
Robbery	1	0	1	2	4
Aggravated assault	1	2	6	5	14
Simple assault	38	26	48	27	139
Intimidation	0	0	0	0	0
Nonforcible sex offense	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against the Person	42	31	55	34	162
Crimes Against Property					
Arson	0	0	0	3	3
Extortion/Blackmail	0	0	0	1	1
Burglary/Breaking and Entering	4	2	2	2	10
Pocket-picking/Purse snatching	0	0	0	0	0
Shoplifting	3	0	2	0	5
Larceny - other	6	5	7	8	26
Motor vehicle theft	0	0	0	0	0
Counterfeiting/Forgery	0	1	1	3	5
Fraud	0	0	3	1	4
Embezzlement	0	1	0	0	1
Stolen property	1	2	1	0	4
Damage/Vandalism	5	4	8	8	25
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0
Total Crimes Against Property	19	15	24	26	84
Other Crimes					
Bad checks	2	1	0	0	3
Drug/narcotic offenses	14	14	12	24	64
Pornography/Obscene material	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling offenses	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution offenses	0	0	0	0	0
Weapon law violations	7	2	2	2	13
Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy violations	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly conduct	1	2	9	10	22
Driving under the influence	23	17	18	28	86
Drunkenness*	90	162	152	285	689
Family offenses, nonviolent	0	0	0	0	0
Liquor law violations	17	14	12	35	78
Peeping Tom	0	0	0	0	0
Trespass to real property	6	4	7	7	24
All other offenses (except traffic)	39	41	64	64	208
Total Other Crimes	199	257	276	455	1,187
TOTAL ARRESTS	260	303	355	515	1,433

*Winchester "drunkenness" includes persons placed in de-tox.