

Dear Sirs

This document contains links to, and summaries of 5 different evidence-based research articles regarding neighborhood crime rates and its relationship to substance treatment centers.

I encourage you to take a moment to review the information as you consider the impact of a Recovery Residence when compared to other currently approved uses in Waterloos B-2 Zoning.

[Substance Abuse Treatment Centers and Local Crime \(iza.org\)](#)

6 Discussion and Conclusion

In the preceding sections, we document statistically and economically significant effects of SAT facilities on drug-related mortality and on several categories of crime. The updated estimates we provide for the effects on county-level drug-related mortality suggest that an additional SAT facility reduces drug-related mortality by 0.50 percent annually. Based on a value of 7 to 8 million dollars per expected life saved, the estimate implies a decline in a county's annual drug-related mortality costs by 4.2 to 4.8 million dollars.^{33,34} Our estimates of the effects on agency-level crime indicate that an additional facility in a county reduces municipal felony-type crimes by 0.10 percent annually. In conjunction with social-cost-of-crime estimates from McCollister, French, and Fang (2010), our estimates indicate that an additional SAT facility in a county reduces municipal crime costs by 0.14 percent annually, which corresponds to approximately \$700,000 per municipality. Given an average of 6 municipal governments in each county, this suggests a decline in annual costs of county-level crime by approximately 4.2 million dollars for each additional facility. In total, these cost calculations suggest that the county-level benefits of an additional facility—in terms of drug-related mortality and criminal activity—are between 8.4 and 9 million dollars. To compare these benefits to the annual costs of treatment at each facility, we can consider the average number of annual treatment admissions (255) from the National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (N-SSATS), and treatment modality-specific cost estimates from French, Popovici, and Tapsell (2008).³⁵ A back-of-the-envelope calculation indicates that the annual cost

[Study Finds Violent Crime Lower Near Drug Treatment Centers Than Other Commercial Areas \(socialworktoday.com\)](#)

The researchers, publishing in the January issue of *the Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, compared 2011 violent crime statistics near 53 publicly funded treatment centers in Baltimore and found that the areas around 53 comparable liquor stores and corner stores saw significantly more homicides, rapes, aggravated assaults, and robberies per business than the areas around drug treatment centers.

The researchers found a 25% increase in violent crime around liquor stores and corner stores as compared to drug treatment centers. Crime around the city's convenience stores was comparable to crime around the treatment centers.

[Not in My Back Yard: A Comparative Analysis of Crime Around Publicly Funded Drug Treatment Centers, Liquor Stores, Convenience Stores, and Corner Stores in One Mid-Atlantic City \(nih.gov\)](#)

In conclusion, DTCs have an unfairly poor reputation as being magnets for crime and a threat to community safety that is not backed up by empirical evidence. By contrast, other community businesses that have a more pronounced magnetic effect on crime are often solicited by communities to locate within their neighborhoods. Future investigations should include a more comprehensive examination of the synergistic effect of having multiple venue types within a defined geographic area, as well as incorporate a broad range of community perspectives to balance the empirical data with residential experiences.

We appreciate your time and attention, and once again urge you to consider passing the Zoning Text Amendment as written by the Planning Commission.

Sincerely

Adrian (John) and Leisa Martinez

Abstract

Substance use figures prominently in criminal behavior. As such expanding public insurance and improving access to substance use disorder (SUD) treatment can potentially reduce substance use and reduce crime. We examine the crime-reduction effect of Medicaid expansions through the Health Insurance Flexibility and Accountability (HIFA) waivers. We find that HIFA-waiver expansion led to a sizeable reduction in the rates of robbery, aggravated assault and larceny theft. We also show that much of the crime-reduction effect likely occurred through increasing SUD treatment rate and reducing substance use prevalence. The implied benefit-cost ratio estimate of increased treatment on reducing crime ranges from 1.8 to 3.2.

[New evidence that access to health care reduces crime \(brookings.edu\)](#)

The authors found that an increase in the number of treatment facilities causes a reduction in both violent and financially-motivated crime. This is likely due to a **combination of forces**: reducing drug abuse can reduce violent behavior that is caused by particular drugs, as well as property crimes like theft committed to fund an addiction. Reducing demand for illegal drugs might also reduce violence associated with the illegal drug trade. The authors estimate that each additional treatment facility in a county reduces the social costs of crime in that county by \$4.2 million per year. Annual costs of treatment in a facility are approximately \$1.1 million, so the benefits far exceed the costs.