

PUBLIC HEARING

before

ASSEMBLY MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

on

THE UTILITY OF THE SAFE AND
CLEAN NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM

Held:

September 27, 1978

City Hall

Paterson, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman Vincent O. Pellecchia, Chairman

Assemblyman Herman T. Costello

Assemblyman Thomas A. Gallo

Assemblyman W. Cary Edwards

Assemblyman Elliott F. Smith

ALSO:

Assemblyman John A. Girgenti

- - - -

James L. Wunsch, Research Assistant

Legislative Services Agency

Aide, Assembly Municipal Government Committee

* * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

before

ASSEMBLY MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

on

THE UTILITY OF THE SAFE AND
CLEAN WRIGHTWOODS PROGRAM

Held:
September 17, 1978
City Hall
Paterson, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman Vincent G. Bellacchia, Chairman
Assemblyman Herman T. Costello
Assemblyman Thomas A. Gallo
Assemblyman W. Cary Edwards
Assemblyman Elliott F. Smith

ALSO:

Assemblyman John A. DiIorio

James L. Wunch, Research Assistant
Legislative Services Agency
Aide, Assembly Municipal Government Committee

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Lawrence Kramer Mayor Paterson, New Jersey	1
Steve Cappiello Mayor Hoboken, New Jersey	10
Ed Chius Business Administrator Hoboken, New Jersey	12
George Crimmins Police Chief Hoboken, New Jersey	15
Russell Sweeten Police Captain Hoboken, New Jersey	17
Anthony Gallo Councilman-at-Large Bloomfield, New Jersey	18
Patrick R. Fiorilli Mayor Vineland, New Jersey	20
Dr. George L. Kelling Police Foundation Washington, D. C.	23
Barry Genesen Coordinator Safe and Clean Program Jersey City, New Jersey	32
Patricia Sheehan Commissioner New Jersey Department of Community Affairs	34
Senator Frank X. Graves, Jr. District #35	44
Paul Kelly Captain, Police Department Union City, New Jersey	49

INDEX (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Thomas Fitzpatrick Chief of Police West New York, New Jersey	55
Lena Sherman Safe and Clean Administrator West New York, New Jersey	55
Thomas Granahan Safe Neighborhoods Unit Commander East Orange, New Jersey	57
Otto Broz Assistant City Engineer Engineering Department East Orange, New Jersey	58
Edward Mandell Director, Housing Services Administration East Orange, New Jersey	59
Conrad Gaskin Municipal Administrator Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program East Orange, New Jersey	60
Thomas Henry Deputy Chief, Police Department Newark, New Jersey	61
John Kinder Mayor Bloomfield, New Jersey	63, 1X & 2X

ALSO:

Statement of Kenneth R. Mahony Business Administrator-Police Director, City of Passaic	3X
Letter from Commissioner Edwin J. Roth Department of Public Safety, Atlantic City	5X
Letter from Frank A. Cyron Director of Public Works, City of Elizabeth	7X
Statement of George J. Otlowski, Mayor, City of Perth Amboy	8X

ASSEMBLYMAN VINCENT O. PELLECCCHIA (Chairman): Good morning. This hearing is called to order. I am Ozzie Pelleccchia, Assemblyman from Passaic County and Chairman of the Municipal Government Committee of the New Jersey General Assembly.

I want to thank Mayor Kramer and Senator - or perhaps more appropriately today - City Council President Graves and the City Council, itself, for permitting us to meet in these chambers.

I am delighted that this hearing could be scheduled in Paterson - both for the convenience of North Jersey citizens and officials; and, quite frankly, so that I could introduce the members of this Committee to my home town where I was born and raised and where I still live.

I have seen great changes in Paterson over the course of my life. I am sorry to say that not all the changes have been for the better, but I still believe in the essential strength of this city and its ability to renew itself.

We meet here today, as we did a week ago in Trenton, to consider a State-sponsored program which was designed to speed that process of renewal. In 1973, the Legislature established the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods program to enhance the quality of life in deteriorating urban neighborhoods. Paterson and 27 other municipalities now participate in the program. Representatives from some of those municipalities and from municipalities which hope to participate in the program have come here to testify. The Committee also welcomes written testimony and will in all cases honor requests that it remain confidential.

Let me say, as I did in Trenton last week, that this Committee has received no evidence of foul play or wrong-doing in regard to this program. I should explain that a standing committee of the Legislature is charged with the responsibility to create new programs, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to monitor the workings of existing programs.

It is particularly appropriate that we should inquire into the operation of the Safe and Clean program which helps fund a broad range of critical municipal activities. For the last several years, funding for the program has been frozen at \$12 million. Because of rampant inflation, the program is, in effect, being cut every year. If the program is working well, strengthening our cities, helping them maintain or build their tax bases, then increasing the Safe and Clean appropriation might make sound fiscal sense. If the program is not working well, we had better try to find out why.

I wish to introduce the other members of the Committee at this time. To my left is Assemblyman Smith and, next to him, is Assemblyman Gallo. Then we have the aide to the Committee, Jim Wunsch. To my far right is Assemblyman Costello and our own Assemblyman John Girgenti, whom I have invited personally to attend because this is his town and I think appropriately he should be with us today.

Now Jim Wunsch will call the first witness.

MR. WUNSCH: The Mayor of Paterson, Lawrence Kramer.

L A W R E N C E K R A M E R: Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Assemblyman, your fellow Assemblymen and your team from Trenton, for caring enough to do the research and the evaluation of State programs, particularly this one. I say that because there are, in our judgment, few programs that have rendered the most direct assistance to the community that this one has.

May I start by saying that I am guilty of a certain pride in having helped some very talented people put this program together. They were representatives of the Department of Community Affairs, working with our Legislature and the Governor, who had the strength and the courage to put together a concept that was bold and creative, and now, unlike many other programs, can be directly measured by its effectiveness. Your continued support and action since the beginning until today has brought about the results that many of our municipalities are experiencing.

It is our judgment that the Safe and Clean Streets Act has been one of the most effective programs that this or any other state has created to attack the two most important issues in urban life that are rapidly becoming vital issues in suburban and even rural life, that of delivering to the residents of a municipality, first, safe; and, secondly, clean communities. The direct aid through this concept has enabled the benefiting municipalities to have an effect on crime rates. Of course, I can speak only of Paterson's experience, but I believe you will find in your hearings that this result has been realized by many others, perhaps in varying degrees. Maybe ours happens to be an exceptional experience due to geography. But I think you will hear from some of my brother and sister mayors, police chiefs and other knowledgeable representatives that their experiences with the program have been the same. We, therefore, want to salute the wisdom of your Legislature for having maintained this program. It is our hope that you will see in it the very significant possibility of delivering results in a program that was so specific about what it could do and then kept its word.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you, Mayor, for a good presentation. I know that you are a bit modest about this. I know that you had something to do with originating it. However, the purpose of the hearings is to find out if, over the years, anything has deteriorated, or if we are doing something wrong in the program. The best way of finding this out is by asking questions. I posed some questions in Trenton concerning this program and the CETA program. It seems that very, very few of the cities, other than Paterson, are using CETA cops plus the Program cops. Can you give me a breakdown of our police as to what categories they fall into: the regular policemen, the CETA policemen, and the patrolmen put on under this Program?

MAYOR KRAMER: What we were able to do four years ago was increase the number of posts by walking men through the Safe and Clean Streets Act by 62. Frankly, it is our belief that nothing reduces crime like the visibility and vigilance of a policeman. It is as simple as that. Crime just doesn't happen in front of them. The critics will point out that that perhaps does not speak to the real socio-economic reasons for crime. That may be debatable. But it certainly reduced crime by a substantial percentage on the streets of Paterson. Those walking posts are established, based on the computer information we receive as to where the crimes are happening and the time of day. That dictates the decision of where the posts will be located. The effect is measurable. The FBI statistics on Paterson's crime rate show a very progressive trend over four years. Of course, one has to recognize that the second, the third and the fourth year were measured against our own improvement. And yet progress is being made.

Our experience with CETA cops was a very educational process. In our burning desire to accelerate the speed with which we could put more men and

women on the street, because of our good experience with these walking posts, we attempted to put together a class of candidates who met CETA qualifications. We ran into --and frankly I think this was more a direct result of the Mayor's mistake because of overenthusiasm than anybody else's that we ran into the problems that we ran into. But we did face the experience of having candidates who had begun the training process fail in police checks that were necessary before they could become full-fledged, eligible, active policemen and police-women. There was no possibility they could reach the streets. But there was, in truth, a legitimate criticism of our action because they had begun the process more rapidly than their brothers and sisters preceding them had.

Putting that experience aside, one cannot deny that we then generated an additional 15 walking men and women who have been added to the original 62. Having learned from our mistakes, we would not hesitate to incorporate that same idea again, most especially after our Mayor has learned patience to clear the police checks before we begin.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Mayor, this subject came up frequently in the first hearing and that is the reason I am pressing on it.

MAYOR KRAMER: Please, go right ahead.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: It is the fact that inflation has decreased the effectiveness of the original million dollars allotted to Paterson. Has it affected the Safe and Clean Streets Program in the number of Patrolmen you use?

MAYOR KRAMER: Most directly, and it has to. The other place a cut was made that gives us great concern - and this was for your protection more than ours - and that was the approximately \$150 thousand that was cut out of monitoring services to be sure that we municipalities were doing what we were supposed to do within the intent of the law. That was arbitrarily removed from the budget and leaves the municipalities in the posture of policing themselves. While I think in most cases that it not a problem, one can recognize that that very well could become a problem.

Let me be direct when I say to you that there is a great desire by any municipality - any mayor, public safety director or chief of police - to have elasticity within the jurisdiction of manpower in public safety areas. And I would be the first support that when an emergency hits, obviously that elasticity must be there. Frankly, it always is. But the burning desire by erosion to begin now some compromise of percentage of direct time that these men and women are to walk posts is in our judgment the beginning of taking a step backwards from the intent of the legislation that you have supported. It was created for a specific purpose and, more than any program I know of, it has kept its promise. To begin to erode that with adjustments for selfish motivations that we mayors or chiefs of police might have, I think is a mistake and a step in the wrong direction.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I have two more questions. If State funds were not available or the matching funds that the city puts to it - I hope everybody is aware that these are matching funds that we are talking about -- if funds were not available, would you maintain the same number of walking Patrolmen from your complement of regular officers?

MAYOR KRAMER: We would be faced with a very, very difficult dilemma because we now know from your program that the results are there. Knowing that,

how do you reduce in good conscience the protection for these municipalities by half, which is what you are paying for? That is another area I would like to comment on. I heard some discussions that municipalities should have this entirely paid for by the State of New Jersey. While I am the first mayor to be anxious to get whatever dollars are available for our community, I think that is a mistake. I think the sharing process is a very important commitment by the participating municipality. The fact that you put your own money in and then it is matched by the State of New Jersey forces your commitment to understanding the responsibility of those dollars. It is an excellent partnership. It speaks to what the Constitution is really all about. Municipalities are, after all, service stations on behalf of State law. That marriage has never worked better in any other program than in this one. It should not be a give-away to the community to use as they see fit, as good as it is. It should continue to be a partnership that makes us, at the local level, put our money where our mouth is, as well as you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I have one final question. Has the City of Paterson ever taken advantage of discretionary funds that are involved in this program?

MAYOR KRAMER: Yes. In fairness to the program, we have spoken only in my presentation of the Safe side. I think you should know that our participation in the Clean side has been equally as important to Paterson. I can name projects that were discussed in Paterson for 25 years and, when it was time to put the budget together, tax burdens and other criteria weighed so heavily on the decision that they had to be forced off that year's agenda and put on the back burner; and they were things that needed doing that have caused marvellous improvements. Molly Ann's Brook in Paterson is a perfect example of that. It was a flooding problem year in and year out. This program was employed. The results have been not only magnificent esthetically, but perhaps even more importantly, there has been the elimination of that very terrible flooding problem that those families along the brook faced every spring and sometimes even in the fall.

Eyesores have been eliminated throughout the city. There have been lighting programs that we have been able to do; recreation areas have been built. It has all been done through this partnership of the city and the State. It seems to me it is a perfect example of how the city and State relationship really ought to work. We should not be your wards. It is not your job to carry the municipalities. But it is, it seems to me, the job of the State to share with us the responsibilities at that local level. This program does that and there are some very specific, excellent examples of that happening. It has to be considered one of the most meaningful programs in our judgment in terms of delivering services to the people of our city that has ever been created.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Mayor, I said I was asking you my last question, but I do have one more.

It seems to me that there has been some kind of an evolution. First, we started with walking patrolmen, then they were mechanized, and now we are back to walking patrolmen. Can you tell me whether during the period of time that the cops were in squad cars there were any walking patrolmen?

MAYOR KRAMER: I am sorry. Could you repeat that?

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: The question is whether or not there were walking patrolmen when all cities had turned to using mechanized patrolmen, for instance, in squad cars?

MAYOR KRAMER: In our case, there were always walking patrolmen in modern Paterson because the results were so great. Let me at the risk of overstaying my welcome give you an example of the serendipity hidden in this program that the authors didn't even foresee - the marvellous effects that you have had from funding this year in and year out. The original concept of the program has proven effective. Crime rates have proved it. The esthetics of the community have improved. You have made the communities safer and cleaner. But we never foresaw the community relations aspect that was going to be ignited as a result of walking patrolmen.

We were busy in police departments throughout the State of New Jersey building community relations offices, staffing them and training people to do that kind of work. We were making some progress - quote, unquote. When a walking patrolman becomes part of a neighborhood, let me show you some of the things that happen.

First of all, he knows who is a stranger. He knows who belongs. He knows who usually closes the shop at four o'clock and wonders why it is still open or why isn't it open when it should be, or who gets off the bus at 4:15 and didn't get off that bus this afternoon. He begins to understand that neighborhood in a way that he could never possibly get to understand it in a rolling unit. Because in a rolling unit, yes, he is on patrol, but the demand today is so great for that rolling unit that he is really responding to calls day in and day out of services. He doesn't get the chance to build those unique relationships. Let's face it, when a policeman has ten kids on a corner talking about turning a rumble into a riot and he can walk to that corner and name seven of them and they know his name, and they know he has a wife and kids and problems of his own, you have a whole different relationship going that you could never get in a rolling unit. He identifies with that neighborhood and they identify with him. He becomes their man or their woman in that neighborhood. That is a chemistry that we were after in a community relations concept and were struggling toward, but got only by the natural osmosis that takes place between the walking man or woman and his or her neighborhood. We never foresaw how valuable that was going to be.

I am absolutely committed to the belief that a great amount of relief in terms of pressure in neighborhoods that we have experienced in the relationship between the policeman and his community is as a direct result of those walking people and what has happened in those neighborhoods. We never foresaw that. There were those who thought it might be of some value, but we never dreamed it was going to be the success in that category alone that it was - and that wasn't even the intent. If that were true, this program would be worth the effort.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: That is all the questions I have. I would now like to call upon the Vice Chairman of my committee, Mr. Costello, for any questions he might have.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: I have a brief comment and then a question or two, Mayor.

First, let me say that I have no qualms whatsoever about the Safe aspects of the program - for the police, fine. Whether we are going to maintain the status quo or increase the moneys remains to be seen. I am certainly not here to suggest that we decrease the money relative to the Safe aspects of this law.

I asked a question when I first sat in on this a few months ago as to

what qualifies a community for Safe and Clean Streets funding. Then I read that all those participating in urban-aid money automatically qualify for Safe and Clean Streets - that as a criterion seems to me not sufficient and, in my opinion, it was poorly thought out - with the exception of three communities that were added in 1978. We are still talking about 28 communities participating in urban-aid money and Safe and Clean Streets. Again, I will say that I have no qualms about the Safe aspects of the program, but I don't know that the intent of the law - this is something you mentioned, Mayor - under the discretionary funds was to provide assistance to the project that you named, the Molly Ann's Brook interceptor. I don't know whether the \$55 thousand used for that was the State's contribution or whether you matched that 50-50. Nevertheless, I find it difficult to believe that it was the intent of the law to provide funds for this type of activity. This is the only question I ask. I can go through all these 28 towns with the exception of two or three whose money went directly to police aid in purchasing equipment or supplementing salaries, etc. --- Now street lighting is great. But when I read about purchasing cranes, filling pot-holes after they did away with the State Aid Road Program ---

MAYOR KRAMER: Let me expand on that. Perhaps I can help you to understand what our feeling was and why we think those are so justified. The intent of the program was really to improve the quality of life in municipalities where we are experiencing abnormal problems. The cities of the United States and the cities of New Jersey don't need charity. We have never asked for it, not the way it is described we have. What we did do was recognize that through the quarantine of geography, cities were given an unfair share of the problems. We are not running from them. But we are saying that to have State or Federal officials provide a program with an attitude of some kind of benevolent uncle is unfair when those same areas of government caused the laws and rules and regulations that we live under to be such that we have an unfair share of the problem.

Take New York City, the real Plymouth Rock of the United States of America. That is where everybody got off. Some spoke our language; some didn't. Some had some wherewithal; others didn't. But the city, itself, because it was where it was became the heir apparent to so many of the problems that we struggle with today. When people did better as a result of receiving free education and went on to other locations, they looked back over their shoulders in disgust - and it shocks me. What I am saying is that when we are going to create law that says, "This location will have more than its share of responsibility and problems on behalf of the rest of us," then there has to be a recognition that we have a responsibility to respond to it.

When you talk about the quality of life, yes, you are talking about crime. But I will suggest to you that the safest city in the world if it were filthy would still be unpopulated and abandoned. I would offer the fact that these things go hand in hand. I will take as a specific incident the crane you referred to. And if I were sitting in your position, I think I would respond the same way you did without hearing all the facts: Gee, did Paterson get a crane there that they use in lots of locations? That alone might be good. But I think if you knew that the key to all of the money that you invested in the improvement of the brook, which you in concept agreed with, was the capability

to protect the interceptor and, therefore, protect the money you invested --- And, by the way, before the crane, we lost a high school boy through the interceptor as a result of the old system that was there. That incident, it seems to me, would be testimony enough to justify the use of that money for that purpose.

The concept of the program on the Clean side to us who were partners in its authorship was that we really were talking about the quality of life in cities. The two priority problems, no matter to whom you spoke, were, in fact, how do you make those cities safe and how do you make them clean? All else, in truth, becomes secondary. The grandiose construction of marvellous estate buildings in a city like Paterson if it is unsafe, I submit, will be meaningless; and if it is safe, but filthy, it will be equally meaningless. So that portion of the program we feel is as important as the formula dictated it should be - and that was two-thirds, one-third - which I think would satisfy your concerns about the emphasis being on the Safe side.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Let me close with this, Mayor. I understood you to say it was primarily for flood control, and what have you. There are funds available for these types of programs from other sources.

I realize the Safe aspect is a major problem with the larger cities. I don't deny that and I would advocate and support that type of legislation as long as I am in the Legislature. But I feel that when we are using the discretionary funds for things like filling potholes when the 567 communities have had taken away from them State aid, it is unfair to the little towns of, say, five or ten thousand people who can't afford to fill them.

MAYOR KRAMER: Let me support you. There are several aspects of the Safe side. Hundreds of children who live along that brook are safer today because you supported this. But the Safe side, as effective as it is --- if you are speaking about the other municipalities, I am on your team. I couldn't agree more that we should expand the number of municipalities able to qualify by the criteria that we could create and apply. This program is so good that everybody in New Jersey ought to have it. Perhaps the way to arrive at it is to take a look at all the other programs we are in and begin to decide where exactly they come down in terms of delivering real measurable results.

I am not attacking any other program, but I think it is fair to say that we could come up with a lot of dollars if we did the homework on some programs that now exist and shift that emphasis. We are not talking about taxes going up; we are talking about them being shared. We are talking about the same dollars being applied in programs we know work. If your argument is that other municipalities should be added to that list, I couldn't agree with you more. The results of this program are so good that I think all 576 municipalities in the State of New Jersey could and would benefit substantially if they could have their fair share, just as they have their fair share of the problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: That is all I have.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: On my extreme left, Assemblyman Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Mayor, I have one question. As we all know, inflationary costs are just eating everything up. We heard testimony in Trenton that it has eaten into the Clean and Safe Streets Act also, particularly the Safe side. If

you had your choice, funding being what it is in the State today and the hue and cry for less taxes, and if we held this program where it is today, would you be willing to sacrifice some Clean aspects to maintain your Safe? In other words, do you feel your walking patrolmen are more important than the Clean aspect? With inflation, we have the increased salaries which we have to face.

MAYOR KRAMER: I think when we wrote it, we put Safe first in the title because that is the way we felt the priority should be - Safe and Clean. So if you put us between a rock and a hard place on the question - would you retreat from one to support the other - we have to say, we have to make them safe before we make them anything else. But, for heaven's sake, please recognize the very unique capability of this program. I am asking you to put it against the many - some excellent, some mediocre and some which perhaps it is time to question - programs that you now fund, support or participate in and compare the results. I know of no State program that can be pointed to with as much pride, due to the direct accomplishments that have been realized by this program of Safe and Clean Streets, which you have given to us now these last five or six years.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I appreciate your comments and I know exactly what you are talking about. I appreciate the program. What I am saying is that we are between a rock and a hard place financially and, if you have to give up something in this particular program to keep it funded at the same level it is now, would you consider giving up some of the Clean to maintain your Safe?

MAYOR KRAMER: I would rather submit a list of programs we would prefer to see you retreat from before you decided the way to fund this one was to steal from it.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Gallo.

ASSEMBLYMAN GALLO: Mr. Mayor, I am very impressed by your presentation.

MAYOR KRAMER: Thank you, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN GALLO: I certainly do believe in the program and honestly feel that the program should be expanded. But in the interest of expanding this program, could you recommend programs that could be eliminated?

MAYOR KRAMER: I would think that an adjustment in some of the programs that now exist could generate some very interesting possibilities of producing dollars that could be made available for some of those other municipalities to qualify. Speaking frankly, sure we want more. But we are not even speaking about more today; we are talking about the fact if you put more money into it, you would get us back to what you originally gave in terms of your half support for this program.

If you are saying to me, "Name the programs we should retreat from in support of this," I will be very happy to submit that list when you tell me that that, in fact, will be done.

ASSEMBLYMAN GALLO: I am very satisfied with his answer, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: While this is not customary, since Assemblyman Girgenti is here today, I certainly want him to participate not only as an observer, but in the questioning too. John, do you have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTII: Mayor, I just want to say that I also am very impressed by your presentation. As one of the major innovators of this program when it was initiated and also now as an administrator of one of the largest cities that is a recipient of this program, my question is: With your background, what do you personally recommend for this program in the future? You could

perhaps add some insight along that avenue. I know you would probably recommend more funding. But beyond that, what changes would you like to see or what would you like to see done with this program?

MAYOR KRAMER: I would like to see us be able to expand the program to other municipalities. It just is so good that they deserve the opportunity to be in this package. Mayors will tell you if they had more money, they could make all of the problems go away. But we all know that throwing money at a problem is not the only answer. We think we could be a little more effective if we had some more money, yes; and I do believe we should take a look at some of the programs that the State is now in and measure the per capita results to see if some shifts can't take place in some of the services we are now attempting to render at the State level to municipalities to this one, including the other municipalities. This program is so good that you have to find a way to give more of them the opportunity to be in it.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Mayor, before I excuse you, I too would like to congratulate you on the kind of presentation you have made. However, I am going to ask you to do something and I hope you will cooperate with the committee. You mentioned other programs. If you could make a list of some of these programs that you think warrant some oversight and submit it to our aide, it would be appreciated. I will ask my aide, Jim Wunsch, to contact you and anything you submit will be treated confidentially.

MAYOR KRAMER: Is it fair to assume from that, Assemblyman, that given some programs to undergo microscopic examination, the Safe and Clean Streets Act would be the direct beneficiary thereof?

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: You had better believe it.

MAYOR KRAMER: That is very encouraging. I also want to thank this very distinguished committee here this morning. It is not only very, very heartening to see that you cared enough to come and ask and seek the answers before you make your vital decisions, but the fact that you bring out to the field the chance for us to appear is just an added compliment to your municipalities. On behalf of the municipalities who benefit and, hopefully, the ones who shall benefit, I want to salute and thank you all for being here and giving us this very special opportunity.

May I conclude by saying to you that as you return to the halls of decision in Trenton, take with you from one municipality at least - and I am confident that each municipality that you have provided this program for will say about the same thing - the feeling that you have made a tremendous difference in crime and cleanliness in the cities through this program. Please continue your effort on our behalf and please consider expanding the effort to some of our sister municipalities - suburban, rural, as well as urban. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

MR. WUNSCH: Mr. Chairman, Kenneth Mahony, the Business Administrator of the City of Passaic, who is the next scheduled speaker, couldn't be here today and he has submitted written testimony which I will include in the transcript. (See page 3X for Mr. Mahony's statement.)

We have four witnesses from the City of Hoboken, headed by the Mayor, Steve Cappiello.

S T E V E C A P P I E L L O: I am Steve Cappiello, Mayor of Hoboken.

Gentlemen, I am here, as Mayor Kramer was, to extoll the benevolence of this program. Hoboken has been very fortunate to be one of its recipients inasmuch as we are one of the older cities in the State of New Jersey which has suffered greatly in the post-World War II era. Our city in that time has lost tax ratables to an extent of 40 percent. Without this program, we would hardly be able to afford the services that we get from it.

Our city had been declining to a very severe extent, so much so that we suffered a major riot in 1971, which caused a great many problems for us. As a result of the program, we have found that we have been able to turn around and create an image of safety and cleanliness.

We, in the past five years, have changed the priority of the program from Safe and Clean to a greater portion of Safe. We, like Mayor Kramer, feel that the cities in the post-World War II era suffered greatly by the movement of business from inner cities like Hoboken where ratables were literally stolen from the cities by the attractive suburbs, leaving in the cities unemployment, deterioration and loss of ratables.

I feel very strongly that the program should be increased because we can ill afford to carry on those services without this program. In 1972, the average pay of a policeman in Hoboken was somewhere around \$10,000. In 1978, the demands by the Hoboken Police PBA are approximately in the \$16,000 area and we feel that we cannot cope with the inflationary spiral in that short period of time. So we look forward to an influx of more dollars than we have had in the past.

Hoboken has also been unfortunate in that we had to shy away from the full amount of the allotment that Hoboken had because we could not afford to put up our own dollars. This is another reason we ask for the kind of assistance that the hearings, I hope, will bring about.

I don't have much more to say, gentlemen, except that I thank you for having me here and I would be very happy to answer any questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCIA: I have only one question. Do you have CETA cops involved in your program?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Let me say first that I have heard about the outstanding program that Hoboken has been involved in over the years, dealing with urban renewal, and what have you. When we hear this in South Jersey, we say, "Well, at least somebody is doing something with the dollars." I am delighted to hear that. I have said time and time again to you and others that I will have to go up and see what you are doing. Perhaps I can take something back to South Jersey - so much for that.

Hoboken, I believe, under the program is earmarked for roughly three-quarters of a million dollars for the Safe aspect of the program.

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Is not eight hundred and some thousand dollars correct?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: That is not so.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: On your basic entitlement, you had \$711 thousand.

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Under the proposed - I am sorry, Mayor - eight hundred and some thousand. That isn't all that great. I am not concerned with that. The question I would ask you, inasmuch as you are only the recipient of \$40 thousand under this discretionary fund, has to do with my big hang up. I would rather put the money in the Safe aspect of this, whether it be for a person or equipment, or for walkie-talkies, or whatever. All of these other things, such as beautification, and what have you - not only the State of New Jersey but the federal government has numerous programs for which municipalities can make application. I would rather see the eight hundred and some thousand dollars under discretionary grant be made available to smaller communities for the Safe aspect. Maybe they could only buy five walkie-talkies - great.

Take the town of Mount Holly, New Jersey, where two police officers were killed and a third one has been disabled for life. Why? Because they didn't have walkie-talkies. They didn't have the money. This is what I am concerned about.

I am going to ask you a question, Mayor, and I would appreciate it if you would give me your true feelings. If I as an individual felt that I would rather see the money go more to Safe than to all these esthetics and the Clean aspect, hoping that those interested in such things can avail themselves of money from other programs, what would be your reaction as a mayor of a city?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: Well, we are using more than two-thirds of our grant for the Safe side. Hoboken is unique in that 50 thousand people or more live in a square mile. We live in very old buildings that are 70, 80 and 90 years old. And we are consistently aware of the rapid deterioration that is taking place to these buildings. Some of the money we have spent for demolition because it was absolutely necessary. We have had buildings cave in in some instances where people were killed.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Out of these moneys?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: I think there might have been some demolition money used, yes. There are four-story walk-ups built of wood that are still standing. You can understand that buildings like that that were built 80 and 90 years ago certainly have got to be watched.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: I will make that an exception. I am talking about building parks and buying some of this equipment.

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: All right. Sometimes there is some equipment that you could buy that might be needed for Safe. We would like to buy some equipment along our riverfront. We have lost many children in the Hudson River. Except for a volunteer in the town who keeps a boat "at the ready" for us, we are never able to do anything about it, neither is Jersey City or Weehawken or West New York. We have to wait until New York City is good and ready to come over with their boats. And I think this is the kind of equipment that could be included as Safe equipment, but it is equipment.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I see that Assemblyman Edwards has joined us.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Yes, I have.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I am pleased to see you.

I will go next to Assemblyman Smith and then come back to you, Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Mayor, I have just one question. You alluded somewhat to the increase in the program. When you increase a program, you talk about dollars. Then you also alluded to the fact that ratables have been lost - and this is true in almost every community in the State. I think you were kind of driving at a sharing portion that was greater than 50-50. Was that your drive or your aim? In other words, are you looking at a 60-40 sharing - 60 percent State and 40 percent municipal - because these are all considerations in the program that we have to look at and take back?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: I would like to see the formula worked up based on the city's ability to sustain itself, so that the rich communities could share less and the poorer communities could share more, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Gallo.

ASSEMBLYMAN GALLO: Coming from Hoboken, I can really understand what the Mayor has been saying. I realize the many problems he is confronted with and our entire city is confronted with. Public safety is certainly a necessity. I believe, if unnecessary programs in the State were eliminated, that the ratio could be increased by the State for these programs and lessened for urban areas, such as the City of Hoboken.

The Mayor is doing an excellent job with what he has. Our Police Department is doing an excellent job. As far as the Clean side is concerned, believe me, Hoboken is becoming clean. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Girgenti.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: Just one question, mayor. In your opinion has the program been effective and what other improvements would you want to add to it in the future?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: Yes, the program has been very effective. Our crime rate is probably lesser now by about 40 percent than when the Safe and Clean program started.

I would like to talk about some elasticity, such as Mayor Kramer talked about. I can remember arguing with Pat at the inception of the program with regard to absolutely walking patrolmen. There are times when there should be some elasticity. I think that should be discretionary with the people working in the administrative offices in Trenton.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Isn't it so that you presently have that discretion in cases of emergencies to use these cops as you see fit at the time?

MAYOR CAPPIELLO: Yes, in severe emergencies.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

MR. WUNSCH: Ed Chius, Honoken Business Administrator.

E D C H I U S: My name is Ed Chius. I am the Business Administrator for the City of Hoboken.

The Mayor spoke of many of the benefits of the program. I would like to speak from an administrative end and a financial end of the city's part in the program. The city was entitled in fiscal '73-'74 to \$711,000, based on our

urban aide allotment. The city was only able to match approximately \$555,000. So the State gave the city only \$555,000.

In 1977, we increased our match to \$629,000 basically because of the inflationary cost of salaries which have risen approximately 40 percent since the inception of the program. We wanted to maintain the program at its current level.

This year we wanted to increase it to the full allotment, but have been unable to due to the lack of funds in the program. In fact, fiscal '77 left no discretionary funds since almost every town went to the entire allotment.

Hoboken is a very densely populated city. It encompasses approximately 1.3 square miles. Most of the residents live in about three-quarters of a square mile. The city is comprised of 15 percent subsidized housing through Section 8 and public housing built by the Housing Authority with federal assistance. The State of New Jersey's Housing Finance Agency has also done a lot of construction in Hoboken and we hope will do more in the very near future. The city has always been an immigrant town. The English language has been a barrier. The program has allowed us to hire many new policemen, approximately 40 since the program has been in effect. All of these people have passed civil service tests and many are bi-lingual, speaking fluent Spanish, which helps us with community relations efforts in many areas of the city.

The Police Chief and Police Captain in charge of the program are here to testify and they can much better explain the Safe part of the program.

The Clean portion of the program has allowed the city to do many improvements which it never would have been able to make otherwise. We have demolished approximately 15 buildings with the program. Many of them are large abandoned factories which were destroyed by fire to the point where they could not be rehabilitated. As you may know, Hoboken has rehabilitated two of its abandoned factories into housing through federal and State assistance. Most of the buildings that we demolish are four- and five-story tenements, which have been either destroyed by fire or abandoned by their owners, are in complete decay, and the engineers have deemed that they are not worth rehabilitating. For every building we demolish, there are at least one or two in the city that are rehabilitated through Section 236 loans and other loans provided by HUD.

We also built a vest-pocket park with the program during its first year. Since then, we have eliminated any park construction or renovation, due to the fact that Greenacre funds are available to us on a matching basis; and we use federal funds to match the State funds. So we have been able to take more money from the Clean portion and give it to the Safe.

The other main area where Clean money was expended was for the purchase of equipment. We have purchased approximately 20 vehicles since the beginning of the program, much of it with discretionary money which was available in a larger quantity at the beginning of the program years.

In my opinion, the program as administered in Trenton is run very well. There is very little red tape involved. The staff comes to the cities frequently to take a first-hand look at how the program is working and help you with forms, etc. They have not tied us down with reports such as similar programs attempted in previous times, such as SLEPA, which has many more reports to do than the Safe and Clean program.

One problem that occurred in the early years of the program which I

would like to speak about is that the program was cut a few times from the Governor's budget during fiscal crises, culminating with the State income tax a few years ago. In one instance, the program was only appropriated for one-half a year. This caused a problem when you had a vacancy in the Police Department. When you were not sure that you could continue the program to its full extent, due to the cut-back in funds or the anticipated cut-back in funds, which was never realized, what you did was hold back on hiring replacements. As people left jobs and we did not fill them, letting attrition run its course, we found at the end of the year we spent less in police salaries than we anticipated. The money then became available in January or February of the following year - the program begins in July. This caused a lot of the cities, I know, to put more money into the Clean side where you could buy a piece of equipment which you needed, etc.

The program has made available to the city funds for equipment that we would probably cut at budget meetings, due to increase in taxes. The city since 1973 has lost approximately 10 to 12 percent of its tax ratables and the amount of taxes levied on the homeowner has gone down, but the tax rate has gone up a few dollars, due to the fact that we have lost ratables. So if we want to spend \$40 or \$50 thousand for a piece of equipment for the Public Works Department to clean sewers, we have a tough time at budget hearings with it, even though the residents complain all the time about their sewers being clogged in the streets. But the tax rate is one of the most important things to the little homeowner who is struggling to maintain his house in the city.

If there are any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCIA: Assemblyman Costello.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: If I may say so, that was a very good presentation. Your demolition expenditures - that came out of your basic funds?

MR. CHIUS: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: I think that it is essential that old buildings that present a safety hazard should come down. I am not advocating we deny you that. But I must point out that conceivably 567 communities could come up here and say, we didn't have funds to buy that piece of equipment to clean out the sewer lines and if it didn't come from the State, we would never get it. But I am saying that a lot of communities out there can't afford to buy equipment. - I am sorry if I keep repeating myself - that are related to the Safe aspects of this program because we are talking about less than a million dollars of discretionary funds. That money would buy a lot of walkie-talkies for the little communities and they are going to say, well, they know we are here and they are going to give us ten sets or five sets, and so be it. That aspect is something I am going to have to give serious consideration to. But as far as the Safe portion is concerned, you have my support all the way. On the discretionary funds, I am going to have to give some serious consideration to that part of it even though your presentation was excellent.

MR. CHIUS: Assemblyman Costello, I would like to point out in fiscal 1977-78, there were no discretionary funds available to the cities, due to the fact that all the cities used their basic entitlements. Most of the discretionary funds came in fiscal '74, '75 and '76, when many municipalities were not able to fully match the program. The federal government gave us a lot of assistance in

the last two years of anti-recession funds, which we hope they will re-enact; and we have been able to come up with the money to match it much more easily.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: That brought to my mind one question I want to ask you. You have difficulty matching on a 50-50 basis. From that I naturally assume you are suggesting perhaps the formula should be changed to 75-25 so you could take advantage of the full amount of money allocated to you.

MR. CHIUS: We would be very happy to have it that way. The main thing, right now, is that you at least give everyone their present basic entitlement. We are being denied our basic entitlement now of \$711,000, due to the lack of funds. If the Legislature added more cities to the program after it was enacted and did not increase the amount of the appropriation, it would be disastrous.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Just a point of information - what type of programs on the Clean side would you be pursuing if this program is maintained at its present level of funding or is increased? You said you bought some equipment, etc. Are you going to go for more equipment or are you going to go into demolition work, or are you going to go into mini-parks? What would your outlook be as far as your thinking or philosophy on the Clean side?

MR. CHIUS: Probably demolition would get top priority on the Clean side since there are no programs to my knowledge available from the State or the federal government for this purpose. Greenacres program provides assistance for mini-parks and renovation of parks. There are also funds available under the community development block grant program for that purpose.

We would probably want to replace trucks which are five years old that are used by employees under the Clean portion of the program, to give them good equipment to use so they could better perform their jobs.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Gallo.

ASSEMBLYMAN GALLO: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Girgenti.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you - and I appreciate your being here.

Before the next witness, I would just like to comment that we are running a little behind. If there is anyone who has a prepared statement, instead of reading it, I would prefer that you turn it over to the secretary and summarize your statement.

Next witness.

MR. WUNSCH: Police Chief George Crimmins from Hoboken.

G E O R G E C R I M M I N S: Good morning, gentlemen. At the outset, I would like to thank the Legislature and the members of the Executive Branch of State government for implementing the Safe and Clean Program. I would also like to commend the Department of Community Affairs for their efficient staff.

The success of the Safe portion of the program in the City of Hoboken has been the subject of national comment. The national crime rates have been

increasing by leaps and bounds over the years. I can point to my own City of Hoboken. In 1972, prior to the Safe program, crime increased in one year 15 percent. Since the inception of the Safe and Clean Streets Act, with the walking patrolmen in the City of Hoboken, in four of the five years the crime rate has decreased. The one year it increased, it increased by approximately seven-tenths of one percent.

Hoboken is a city whose citizens are of a very low socio-economic class. Fifty percent approximately are non-English speaking, predominantly Spanish. Even though police administrators throughout the world agree foot patrol is the most expensive type of patrol, gentlemen, I want to say that it is the most necessary type of patrol. It is provincial. The radio patrol car is more an "after the fact" part of police practice and procedures.

Hoboken is 1.3 square miles in area, but about 50 percent or better is used for industrial purposes. So you can see how closely the people live together. Again, statistics will show that the closer the people live together, the more demands for services there are, and especially with a low socio-economic group.

I beg - I implore - the Legislature to continue this program and, if at all possible to increase the funding to the cities. I would be very happy to answer any questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: I have no questions. Your remarks were very good.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Chief, you mentioned that the crime rate has dropped and you feel it is as a result of the walking patrolmen. Are there any other factors involved that have helped reduce the crime rate in your town, in your opinion?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: Gentlemen, I can't argue with success. Before the advent of the strict foot patrol under the Safe Act, crime was going up; and with the advent of these 15 walking posts that we have in the city - and we have them on two tours during the demanding hours, 11 A.M. to 7 P.M. and 7 P.M. to 3 A.M. - crime has gone down. It did not go down with my Detective Division, my Uniformed Patrol Division, plus the other units.

So, Mr. Assemblyman, I again say, with the foot patrol, the acceptance by the people of the cop on the post is very good and it has been fabulous.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I appreciate your comments because as I view this program, we have to look at some other factors that might be involved in it; and I think that your testimony has borne out that the foot patrolman is very definitely a factor in this crime rate reduction. There is no question in my mind about that.

CHIEF CRIMMINS: Definitely, sir. I have been a policeman for close to 33 years and, in my experience, there is nothing like the foot patrolman.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Gallo.

ASSEMBLYMAN GALLO: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Girgenti.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: Chief, I have just one question. Before this program commenced, you did not have any foot patrols?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: Let me say the demands for service left much to be desired in the foot patrol. Any overflow we had would go to the foot patrol.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: How many foot patrolmen do you now have as a result of the program?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: We have 46 men assigned to the Safe portion.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I assume, as you said before, you definitely feel that this is a factor in the crime rate?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: Without a doubt.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I tend to agree with you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I don't know if I am repeating John's questions. But if the foot patrol has been such a contributing factor in the reduction of the crime rate, why wasn't it used before as a priority rather than secondarily? Why did you have to wait for some grant? Why wasn't it being used as a primary police function out of your normal budget?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: Prior to my becoming Chief, the emphasis had been more on the assignment to other duties. Since I have become Chief and with our present Mayor, we have reduced the size of the other forces. The Detective Division has been cut by almost 25 percent. Therefore, I advocate foot patrol and always have. But I have never been in a position to do anything about it. And I have been Chief since 1970.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: What would happen if you were not to receive the Safe funds that Hoboken is presently receiving?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: I shudder to think of the results.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: What recommendation would you make with reference to your internal budget operations and handling of the department?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: In the handling of the department, we are presently under contract to maintain certain aspects under the PERC law. That has to be given first consideration. We would definitely have to cut services to the public - vital services, such as patrol, radio car patrol, possibly even in the field of the vice area, specifically narcotics. I would have to take some of the men out of there and I don't want to do that.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: But you would still leave the walking patrol as a priority?

CHIEF CRIMMINS: That is my pet. Foot patrol is my baby.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Any further questions? Thank you, sir, for a fine presentation.

MR. WUNSCH: Police Captain Russell Sweeten.

R U S S E L L S W E E T E N: I am Captain Russell Sweeten of the Hoboken Police Department and I am directly in charge of the Safe portion of the program.

I can't go over and over again everything that was said about how effective the program is and why it was a success. The crime rate has gone down. We cannot function without this program.

The present caps have us at a point where if you discontinue this program, we couldn't even do it if we wanted to. We couldn't increase our budget enough to hire back the men that we would have to let go.

As to your question before about CETA policemen as opposed to the Safe police officers, our men are fully trained. They have taken the tests. They are fully qualified. It took 25 years for Police Departments to get

qualified men. The CETA programs and the other programs tried to sneak in under the qualifications and we get less qualified people. And we can't operate with them in this day and age.

Other than that, I would just be repeating what everyone else has said.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: You raised the question I have been asking most frequently about the CETA cops.

CAPTAIN SWEETEN: It is the qualifications.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: The CETA cops are really a temporary thing. Are they placed in duties of walking patrolmen? Are they placed in a specific operation in your town?

CAPTAIN SWEETEN: We have one program where we have men in the parks. They are unarmed, but they are in uniform and it takes a uniformed police officer to come to their aid when they need help. You just have to supplement them with uniformed police officers.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

Assemblyman Costello, any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: No questions, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Does anyone have any questions? (No questions.)

I see Hoboken was very well represented. They had probably more testifying than any other city and they are to be commended because of their interest.

MR. WUNSCH: Anthony Gallo, Councilman-at-large from Bloomfield.

A N T H O N Y G A L L O: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I think Mayor Kramer sort of preempted my remarks by making the statement: Give every community its fair share.

I first want to read a very short statement.

I have been a strong supporter of the Safe Street Program since its inception. It is a program in which the taxpayers of our State have received "true dollar" value. The testimony today has been overwhelming in favor of continuing this most worthwhile program.

I appear this morning on behalf of the citizens of the Town of Bloomfield. Bloomfield is one of 28 communities eligible for Safe Street funds. Bloomfield is flanked by several communities that enjoy this program now. Unfortunately, Bloomfield has not received to date one cent in Safe Street moneys. The 52,000 residents, which include 10,000 senior citizens, deserve the high visibility of walking policemen that our neighbors enjoy.

The geographic location of our town, being contiguous with three other communities receiving these funds, makes our law enforcement problem much more difficult. The residents of Bloomfield need and, equally important, deserve your support.

This has been a very simple statement and it is a very simple request. In my opinion, there is a very simple solution, and that would be to give all eligible communities an equal percentage of their allotment, thereby discriminating against none.

Some towns receive 100 percent of their allotment. Some towns receive 70 percent. Some towns receive 50 percent. Bloomfield, Rahway, Keansburg receive zero percent. In my opinion, that formula is extremely unfair to the

State of New Jersey.

I made a commitment two years ago because Safe Streets has been my pet project -- I made a commitment to the residents of Bloomfield that they would see walking patrolmen. With your help, that commitment can become a reality. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Councilman Gallo, I appreciate your remarks, probably more so than the rest because we on this committee are aware that you are an urban-aid city and only recently were added to the program. The only difficulty has been that because of the financial crunch that we have had we weren't able to fund the program for those cities which were added this year.

MR. GALLO: I think Governor Byrne in his wisdom saw fit to cut some allocations for some towns so that the moneys would stretch. What I am saying is: come up with a formula so all towns can receive some funds. I agree with Mr. Costello and my concern is primarily for the Safe aspect of the program. We are doing things now, trying to resolve that problem. We have citizens that are doing security work and doing patrol work. Naturally it is not with the same effect ---

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: We agree and I am pretty sure everyone on this committee believes that there is an injustice there and we would like to correct it. However, we also recognize that there are 567 communities in this State that would be asking for the same thing. But we do have as criteria the urban-aid municipalities and you fall within that criteria. There is no reason you shouldn't be receiving the aid now. I would hope that when this committee finishes its task that does happen.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: A question came to my mind when I saw you were one of the three communities that were not funded. In the event -- and I don't know where it would come from --- but in the event there might be some moneys available possibly because cities like Hoboken couldn't meet their matching share and, therefore, couldn't take advantage of their full allocation, would Bloomfield be in a position to provide matching funds in order to qualify?

MR. GALLO: I was down in Trenton talking to Mr. Skokowski and he assured me that the community block grants are eligible to be used as matching funds. We have set aside a portion of our funds to match the moneys coming from the State if we are successful in receiving Safe Streets money. In the interim, we are upgrading our communications so that we have the finest communication system in the State, so that when we do get walkie-talkies people are going to be able to hear them.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Let me conclude with this, if I may, Mr. Chairman: I think it would behoove somebody then, perhaps your legislator, to go back to Trenton and see if there are any moneys that haven't been spoken for because of the lack of matching funds and also see if they cannot then be diverted to Bloomfield, Keansburg or Rahway. That might be worthwhile doing.

MR. GALLO: I am under the impression that there are no funds available.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: You are precisely right. Every municipality that is participating is now participating at full strength and there are no discretionary funds available. I think, in this case, we ought to be looking for some way to help the three communities that are now part of the Urban Aid Program.

Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I am just a little concerned as to why all the funds are being used up. I think maybe the Commissioner might be able to answer my questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: The Commissioner will be here this afternoon. I believe she is the person to answer your question.

Assemblyman Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I have the same question but I will defer it until later.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Girgenti.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I am not a member of this committee, but I know the situation you were talking about when we this year earmarked those three cities to be Urban Aid cities.

The fact of the matter is, we have heard testimony before from other municipalities that they are under a crunch too. We would have to take money away from places like Paterson, Hoboken, etc., which I don't think is your intention. That was the situation we were in. All I can say is that we are heading in the right direction. You have been named an Urban Aid municipality which puts you in there. The point is to get some funding for you in the future. I don't think we want to slice up existing programs in municipalities which now have them.

MR. GALLO: I think Governor Byrne has already initiated a program to that effect, by cutting certain towns to spread the money a little further. What I am suggesting is that it be more equitable.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: The Legislature saw fit to keep it the way it is at the present time.

MR. GALLO: The one point I wanted to make was the geographic location of our community; being surrounded by three towns that enjoy the program now makes our job that much more difficult.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: Councilman, I, as Assemblyman Pelleccchia said, sympathize with you. I was one of the ones, along with, I think, everyone else here, to make your municipality an Urban Aid community. The trouble is the funding.

MR. GALLO: Thank you very, very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

MR. WUNSCH: Mayor Patrick R. Fiorilli from Vineland.

P A T R I C K R. F I O R I L L I: Gentlemen, I am sure in the course of your hearings, you will hear a multitude of justification for the program. I would like to point out that Vineland was one of two cities who did not accept the program the first year; due to the lack of wisdom of the prior city administration, they chose not to pick it up. Then in the second year, they did pick it up. It has great advantages. I would urge its refunding. Perhaps there is room for modification.

I realize in any program that you come up with, whether it is this or others, there are going to be people who sit here just as I am doing and say, "Refund it. We need it. Increase it. Change the ratios in it," and everything else. I say that because I sit on the Board of Governors of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and we receive similar appeals.

I also realize that in many of the submissions, there are worthwhile

programs and others that should be made into paper airplanes and sailed out the window. I am not suggesting you do that with this program.

I would like to point something out other than facts and figures. I would like to point out a reality, something we did in the City of Vineland through the Safe and Clean Program, using both sides of it. When I took office two years ago, in the center city section of Vineland we were virtually sitting on a powder keg. We had a situation of about five to six hundred youths on the streets in a concentrated area with nothing to do. The youths on the street were Hispanic. The neighborhood was one of older retired Italians. One aggravated the other. Both were at fault, but no one would take the blame. Police response time down there was impossible to keep count of. There were all sorts of incidents and we were scared to death that we would have a riot.

I took a young policeman, a Safe and Clean walking patrolman, and I assigned him to sort of a special task down there. I picked him for three reasons. First, he was 24 years old. He was young enough to mix with the kids. Second, he was born in Argentina and spoke Spanish. And, third, he was Jewish which made him impartial between the Spanish and the Italians. His instructions were to pick the hours that he thought he should be there, so long as he worked a normal day, and to mix with the kids and find out what our problems were, also what could be done about them.

In the course of the two and one-half months that he did this, I'd meet with him regularly and we would sit on the curb with a gang of kids and talk about the problems. Incidentally, all conversations were in Spanish. There was never a word spoken in English. We found that recreation was a problem. There was an old basketball court on one corner which really didn't serve any useful purpose. It wasn't lighted and couldn't be used at night. It was falling apart. I told them that a park was planned on that very corner. They wanted to know what was going to be in the park. Just having taken office, I really didn't know. The Recreation Commission normally handled that. I suggested that they come up to the Mayor's office the following night and we would have the Recreation Commission and roll out the plans for this park and show them what was going to be in it.

Our Recreation Commissioners are good people, but the average age on the Commission is 55 years. When we rolled out the plans on a large table, it looked like a glorified traffic circle with benches, which would have been fine for a senior park, but that wasn't our problem. We didn't have that problem in the area. The kids were disgusted and I was disgusted. I made them an offer. I said, "You tell us what you want in that park and we will design it around what you will use." I did that because we had another park which we built with community development block grant funds which has all sorts of equipment in that some hot-shot salesman sold to us and the kids don't use. It was just a waste of money sitting there.

After seven meetings with the City Engineering Department, with the kids and with the patrolmen involved, they designed their own park. I used to brag about having the only park in the State designed by the kids who were going to use it. According to one of Patricia Harris's assistants, it may be the only one in the country. They literally designed their own park and said what they wanted in it, and we built the park with community development block grant money. But it was toward the end of the year. We had no

Greenacres funds available to us because there was another project pending and they won't fund two at one time. We used up the balance of community development money, but we had no money for lighting in the park. So we used some Safe and Clean money to put lights in. And we took four to five hundred kids off the street.

Our police response time in that area was reduced by 31 percent, which gives our 103-man Police Department a break because they have to cover a 69 square mile area. But even more amazing than that was the statement by a member of the County Probation Office who at a meeting one night said, "Mayor, what are you doing in Vineland? You are doing something different." I asked why he said that. He said, "Your juvenile crime rate among Hispanics has dropped more than 50 percent in one year." That park is the reason for it. Without this program there wouldn't have been such a park. We still have Safe and Clean men walking through the area. In fact, in the course of this, the kids challenged the local Police Department to a basketball game. I almost fell out of the chair when they did it because the kids play basketball 10 and 12 hours a day and some of our policemen are a little overweight and out of trim. But they did play and the kids beat the policemen five to one. This was arranged, I might say, by a Safe and Clean officer. But out of that basketball game came a strange thing, no longer did a police car ride through the area and have the occupants be called names. It is now, "Hi, Joe; hi, Frank; and how are you?" There is an altogether different relationship.

We accomplished more with that small investment of an officer, the lights and the use of the Safe and Clean program than we could have accomplished by dumping another \$2 million in police reserves into that area. We also have the only park in the city which has no vandalism because the kids designed it and it is their park. You go there and try to spray some graffiti on the wall and they will break your arm. They also police the park, which relieves the city from doing it. They have a committee set up. When they find people that they think shouldn't be there for one reason or another, they move them out of the park.

I cite that as one example because that is perhaps the most dramatic example of what this money could be used for. There are many other things that we have used it for. This produced visible results. This has cut the expense to the taxpayers by eliminating the need for a large police force in the area; and, without the Safe and Clean program, this could not have happened at all.

That is all I have to offer, gentlemen.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: That was an interesting story, especially where the kids beat the police.

I have no questions, but maybe Assemblyman Costello has, because I think that this is his bag.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: I met the Mayor about three or four months ago. I saw him come in and I said to myself, "I should know this gentleman." We did a show together and that was the only confrontation I had with him. I am almost reluctant to comment, Mayor. The \$25 thousand discretionary grant, is that what you were referring to - the beautification program which would include the senior citizens' center, parking lot and fees for architectural

services?

MAYOR FIORILLI: In the Vineland program? No, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Then somebody has ripped me off. What you mentioned was commendable. I would support that. But from what I have here, they have allocated \$25 thousand of discretionary funds for that which I mentioned. That is for '76-'77.

MAYOR FIORILLI: All right. I was thinking of the senior citizen high-rise program. I am sorry. This is a different one.

The Senior Citizens' Center is a public library that was donated to us by the Carnegie Foundation back in, I think, 1970, which we outgrew. It is a very picturesque building. We didn't want to tear it down. So we turned it into a Senior Citizens' Center. It is in the target area where we have the problems -- where we had the problems and where we are eliminating them. I didn't realize there were fees for architectural services involved in this, to be honest with you. The parking lot and the lighting, and so forth, that is there had to be done because it was - and still is in a certain sense - a high crime area. It is one block off our main street, but it is in the real target area. This is a case where we have people coming in there for different meetings and functions who are actually scared. We had to provide them with some lighting. If no one was on the street, because of their age and their inability to move fast, they would be afraid. That is why this was included in that discretionary fund.

I will have to admit to you, Assemblyman, that I don't always agree with some of the things that discretionary funds are used for. I will agree with you on that. But in this one particular case, it was something that could reduce a potential crime problem in the area and prevent us from having to put a policeman there all the time to sit in that building.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: You are a very good witness for the program.

MAYOR FIORILLI: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Before lunch, we will have two other speakers. Will you call the next speaker?

MR. WUNSCH: Dr. George Kelling from the Police Foundation, Washington, D. C.

G E O R G E L. K E L L I N G: If you don't mind, Mr. Chairman, I think I can use my time most efficiently if I work from my document. I am a researcher and some of the things I talk about are somewhat technical. I practiced it and it doesn't take too long.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: By all means, proceed as you choose.

DR. KELLING: Gentlemen, thank you for inviting me to meet with you to discuss the Safe Streets and Clean Neighborhoods Act and, by implication, foot patrol. As most of you know, the Police Foundation, the organization by which I am employed, is now conducting a study of foot patrol in New Jersey. That study, not yet completed, is under my direction and will be conducted in 28 cities at various levels of intensity.

In three of those cities, foot patrol is being examined in depth; in a fourth, the Foundation is collaborating with the Police Department in the conduct of a formal experiment.

Interest in this study of foot patrol is high. Visitors from as far

away as England and Australia have expressed interest and come to New Jersey. There have been suggestions of replicating at least parts of the study in Australia, where, similar to the United State, foot patrol had all but faded from existence, started to make a comeback, and is popular with citizens and merchants.

I would like to make two introductory comments and then briefly discuss each.

First, what little evidence there is - and now I am speaking as a social scientist and I don't mean to disagree with the police officials who have spoken up to now --- first, what little evidence there is at the present time about the effectiveness of foot patrol is contradictory and it is difficult to make definite statements about foot patrol's efficacy. I will return to this point later.

Second, the evidence regarding motorized patrol is substantial. Sophisticated studies have been conducted. Although replications of major studies have been of limited duration, they confirm important findings.

Motorized patrol is the basic means of delivering police services in the United States. When it was first introduced, advocates of the radio car were so enthusiastic that they believed that they could completely wipe out urban crime. Initially, O. W. Wilson, who was to become the great theorist of what came to be known as preventive patrol, saw the use of the car as a means of increasing the range of foot officers. That is, police officers could use the car to go from beat to beat, thereby increasing the number of foot beats that could be patrolled.

Slowly, however, the use of the car changed from transporting officers from foot beat to foot beat to driving the automobile around the city as an end in itself. Wilson and others theorized that if police could rapidly and unpredictably move police vehicles through city streets, it would be possible to create a feeling of police omnipresence in the community. That feeling of omnipresence would, in turn, result in deterring criminals, thereby prevent crime, increasing citizen satisfaction with police, decreasing citizens' fear of crime, and generally making the cities more civil and pleasant places to live in.

Beyond those supposed benefits, another benefit of preventive patrol would be that police would be available to respond more rapidly to calls for service. That, it was hypothesized, and believed, would result in apprehending criminals in the act of committing crimes, increasing citizen satisfaction with police, and reduce citizen fear.

Police and theorists so firmly believed in the efficacy of these practices that computer-based, police allocation models were developed. The goals of these allocation models were to have police respond to calls in less than three minutes and, when not committed to calls, drive their vehicles so as to cover as much territory as possible. Priority was given to reducing the length of time spent at calls. Organizational pressure was directed at getting police who had responded to calls for service back into their cars and patrolling as soon as possible.

In a strange twist of language, police were "out of service" when dealing with citizens and "in service" when doing nothing but driving their vehicles.

Throughout the 1960's police chief after police chief argued for more and more police and more and more cars on the basis that if police could only increase coverage by a given factor, substantial reductions in crime could be made. Even the President's Crime Commission in 1967 so firmly believed in the efficacy of preventive patrol that it advocated its use, while conceding that it seemed to contribute to police-citizen alienation.

The strategy of preventive patrol was logical. And police, good police, believed it. I, by no means, wish to disparage them. They were confronted with the serious escalating problems of crime. Citizens and their representatives demanded solutions. The trouble was that although the theory and strategies of preventive patrol had an inner logic, there were no outside empirical data to confirm that logic.

During the late 1960's and early 1970's police departments and researchers began to evaluate systematically preventive patrol. Without going into the studies in detail - I can provide the committee with them - they showed that arrests made from aggressive, proactive patrols were an extremely small percentage of total arrests. This was true even though police were allocated on the basis of crime interception tactics. Further, it was found it was difficult to get convictions from those arrests.

More importantly, these studies show that substantially increasing or decreasing levels of preventive patrol - that is, automotive patrol - made no difference in crime levels, citizen fear or satisfaction, arrests, or anything else for that matter. In the area of response time, it was found that short response time had, for all practical purposes, no benefit at all. Part of the reason for this is that citizens wait 20 to 40 minutes before calling the police following a major crime. This usually was the result of the crime victims' confusion and fear and his or her hurried calls to a loved one, friend or boss for advice.

These studies also found that citizens' satisfaction with police response time is much more a function of their expectation of how long it will take the police to arrive rather than how long it actually takes. Thus, if the police are expected in three minutes but arrive in five, citizens tend to be dissatisfied. If citizens expect the police in eight minutes and they arrive in five, citizens tend to be satisfied. So the more the police trumpet short response time, the more likely they are to increase citizen dissatisfaction when normal delays occur. Finally, studies showed that if the police tell citizens that there will be delays of up to an hour in responding to calls, those delays will not affect citizen satisfaction.

In summary, the effectiveness of preventive patrol and rapid response time to calls for service has not been demonstrated.

But a final word of caution. The research into response time and preventive patrol does not provide justification for reduction of police or give evidence that conspicuous police presence is not important. I believe that police presence, again, conspicuous police presence, does deter crime, affect citizens and reduce fear. The research to date gives evidence that motorized patrol has not created feelings of police omnipresence and suggests that other means of providing that presence and its benefits will have to be found.

One means of obtaining the benefits of a conspicuous police presence at some times, and at certain kinds of locations, may be foot patrol. As I

implied in my introductory comments, there are few major evaluations of foot patrol. For the most part, they are uncontrolled, often impressionistic, and of short duration. The best, done in England, which has never been published, showed that by increasing foot patrols from zero levels to one officer per beat did affect crime rates.

Let me give you some impressions about foot patrol.

Citizens and business people like foot patrol. Time and time again, business people have said - and these are in conversations with them - that the final straw in breaking their business and forcing them to close would be the removal of foot officers from their areas. Further, citizens like foot patrol, and it is naive to dismiss citizens' appreciation of foot patrol as uninformed romanticism. If citizens like foot patrol, feel it makes a difference and act on that belief, that, in itself, is important to city life.

The goals of foot patrol vary greatly. In some areas, foot officers regularly respond to calls for service. In others, they are either by design or inadvertently passed by and not so used.

In some cities, foot officers make many arrests - in others, not.

Many chiefs, given a choice, would abandon foot patrol and allocate officers differently. Most often, they would allocate foot officers to motorized patrol.

Based on observations in non-New Jersey cities, I am certain that even if chiefs of police sanctioned foot patrol only when officers were not involved in other activities, that the organizational pull away from foot patrol to radio cars is so strong that foot posts would be patrolled minimally. In one city, officers in an area were ordered to walk when not responding to calls for service. Routinely, officers would stop their cars, briskly walk around one city block, and get back into their cars. So much for foot patrol. I give another example here of a city in which even though the management believed that foot patrol was between 75 and 90 percent, in actuality, it operated no more than 30 percent.

The Police Foundation researchers are now doing a cost-benefit analysis of foot patrol and comparing costs of foot and motorized patrol. The Foundation does now have costs analyses completed for one large New Jersey city. The benefit analysis, unfortunately, is not completed. Before I give you the costs, I would like to make a few cautionary comments.

The calculation of benefits from policing is extremely difficult. In the past, the issue was begged by the use of such indicators as short response time, the number of times a car had passed a particular point, calls responded to, miles driven, etc. As I am certain all of you recognize, these indicators suggest what police do, not what effect what they do has.

Likewise, even such indicators as arrests are very difficult to handle. The issue of what a "good" arrest is is very complex. One cannot say that it is automatically good to make an arrest or, for that matter, not to make an arrest. Further, calculations must take territory covered, citizen feelings of safety and security and other complexities into account.

With that as introduction to cost analysis, the Foundation has preliminary calculations from one city which suggests that to patrol a beat 24 hours a day by car costs \$664,789 annually. This figure includes city and police overhead charges. That is, we have applied the standard cost accounting system used by businesses and allocated costs from supporting divisions to producing divisions. Similarly, patrolling a foot beat 24 hours a day costs \$178,277.

Restated, this means that to be justified on a cost basis, motorized patrol must be 3.83 times as effective as foot patrol. I urge caution in use of this figure as it indicates only cost and not benefits. But I believe these figures to be representative and conservative.

Tomorrow I will be sending rough drafts of this, for their use, to the Attorney General's Office, to the Department of Community Affairs and to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency - and, if the committee so desires, I will send a copy to the committee as well.

These, then, are the comments that I can make about foot patrol. I wish the Foundation's study were completed so that I could provide you with more definitive information.

The New Jersey Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Act has been, and is, an important development in policing. And I would add, not only in New Jersey but nationally and internationally as well. The study is being looked at from all over the world. I believe it is likely that we are going to make important findings about how and where foot patrol can be useful in making cities safe and pleasant places in which to live. The Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Act and the attendant administrative mechanisms of the Department of Community Affairs have allowed and, in some instances, forced police to consider new ways of addressing the problems of crime and delivering police services in urban centers.

Thank you, gentlemen.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCIA: Dr. Kelling, I am overwhelmed with your report, and the service you have done for this committee is far more than you realize. I think you are the first one who has testified with any kind of statistics or anything else. I believe that it is certainly going to be useful; and, yes, this committee would like a report from you if we can possibly get it.

I have no comments to make about your presentation. I think it speaks for itself and we can use it in our workshop most effectively. There is only one thing I would like to hear from you. It is amazing that no one has come up with this. This program is on a year-to-year basis and nobody has come up with the suggestion of whether or not it should be a permanent program. I would like to hear from you on that issue alone.

DR. KELLING: This puts me into the fiscal situation of New Jersey, which I am somewhat uncomfortable with, as I am a guest to your State. My feeling is that the present Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Act - and I will only speak to the Safe part because that is all I know anything about - has really been an impetus for reform in policing that has caught on nationally and, now slowly, internationally. In England, for example, they were starting to abandon foot patrol and going more and more to what is called in England fire-brigade policing. They are now starting to back away from that and that is part of the reason there have been guests here.

My own feeling is, given the desperate situation of cities, that this kind of support is necessary, at least during the transitional phase. As a result of the use of the telephone for calls for service, police are in the state of being overwhelmed by calls for service. Right now, the National Institute on Law Enforcement and other organizations are looking at ways to cut back on the demand for calls for service, finding it relatively unprofitable. During this interim phase, at least the restrictions imposed by the Safe and

Clean Neighborhoods Act means that departments have no choice. They have to provide this additional service. I feel it is a very, very essential service. I think one can walk in the streets and feel the difference. When a foot officer walks by and a car goes by, one feels the presence of the foot officer - one does not feel the presence of the marked car. Additionally, sometime, go into some of these inner-city neighborhoods and watch the response of juveniles when police walk by and when a radio car goes by. The response is substantial.

Now I don't know over the long haul, say, 10, 12 or 15 years from now, whether it is the best approach. I know for the foreseeable future, it has added an important ingredient to police and has brought the police back into close contact with citizens. I think that the community relations benefit is not only important for community relations purposes, but I think it is a powerful anti-crime tool, in that foot officers can get information that other officers can't because they are close to the citizens. And the citizens, even the street people, are asking for protection. I have seen this because I have walked with officers in several cities in New Jersey and I have a staff that is doing that regularly. I hope that is responsive.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Costello.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Let me simply say this: Your testimony has made my travelling up from South Jersey and getting lost three times worthwhile.

I know that this will eventually come out in a document and we will receive it. But would it be possible for me to have a xeroxed copy of that as soon as possible?

DR. KELLING: I do have some additional copies with me.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I have a couple of questions on the criteria used for determining when and where foot patrols are effective. Do you have any suggestions as to how those criteria should be established, as opposed to the method that New Jersey is using?

DR. KELLING: Fortunately, as I have walked foot patrol here, I find that foot patrol is in a wide variety of kinds of neighborhoods. From my standpoint as a researcher, that is superb. I have walked foot patrols in residential areas and public housing areas, which are also residential; business areas; commercial areas; and areas around schools. One of the things that we are going to be looking for is to find out: Where does it have the most impact? At the present time, speaking as a conservative researcher, I couldn't make recommendations regarding that. However, I feel that is going to be some of the important findings that we will have available by June of 1979; where foot patrol most seems to take hold.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I also would like to get a copy of your statement if you have any. You said your report will be finished in June, 1979?

DR. KELLING: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Are you familiar with the criteria presently used in New Jersey?

DR. KELLING: I must confess that I was. So much time has passed and since I have been working on this project for two years, I am not now familiar with it. My staff is, and I apologize that I am not up to date on it.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I have one question. Your cost per car, was that \$64,000?

DR. KELLING: \$664,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Six hundred?

DR. KELLING: \$664,000 per car - that's a two-person car - per year.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I asked this question earlier in the day. Are there any other factors in your experience that you have seen that might have reduced this crime rate in the walking patrol areas other than the physical presence of the officer in the area? We have heard testimony that there has been from 30 to 50 percent reduction in crime - some have been higher and some have been lower. But that seemed to be the average of crime reduction in a post walking patrol area. Are there any other factors, other than the physical presence of the man and the rapport that he has with the public, that can be considered in that realm of possibility?

DR. KELLING: Again I will introduce my comment by saying, understand that I am very conservative and I have to be. The first comment that I would make is that there has been a general downward trend in terms of crime over the last five to seven years. That has been the general tendency. It seems to have peaked and seems to have been going down.

If, indeed, the figures are accurate - and I have no reason to doubt them, except that from my conservative point of view as a researcher I would have to look at them in great detail --- if, indeed, they have gone down 30 to 50 percent, that would be spectacular and one would suggest that that would be the result of foot patrol. We will be able to address that issue because in the largest city we are working in, under experimental conditions, we have manipulated the levels of foot patrol so we will be able to tell if, indeed, it is foot patrol that seems to be making the difference.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: It is a little premature then now to ask that question.

DR. KELLING: I wish it wasn't.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I wish it wasn't either. Thank you very much. I would also like a copy of your statement.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Girgenti.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I have just really a comment. I also think your report so far was very fair in terms of what you brought back to us. Since my own parents own a small business in Paterson, I know the presence of a foot patrolman is very important to them.

Is your study being done just for New Jersey?

DR. KELLING: The study is being done with Police Foundation funds. It is being done just in New Jersey. We started to work in other areas, but we couldn't complete it because there wasn't the level of foot patrol that they thought. The reports will be made to New Jersey. Once everyone agrees and signs off on them, they will be published nationally and internationally.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I was wondering whether there were any other states or areas that have gone into foot patrol on a stronger level. You said we were one of the initiators ---

DR. KELLING: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: (Continuing) --- in terms of the Safe and Clean Program, starting the trend back toward foot patrol.

DR. KELLING: There are cities, such as Cleveland - I could list quite a few - that are returning to foot patrol, but on a very ad hoc basis. One of the things that is surprising is that in at least three cities now --- and there is now forming a national organization, the exclusive purpose of which is to get foot patrols back into the cities. And primarily, interestingly enough, that is being done by poor citizens who are demanding more protection and feel the only way they will get that protection is by having foot officers. Although many of them come from minority backgrounds, they don't care if the walking officer is white or black or Spanish, whatever. They want police protection and they feel that foot patrol is the surest way to get it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: And the mechanism for funding this has been, at this point, within that community?

DR. KELLING: Always local. There is no parallel program in the United States, such as the New Jersey Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Act.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: At this time, I would like to have the aide to the Committee ask a few questions.

MR. WUNSCH: Dr. Kelling, let me try to clarify something. You spoke about the pull on a police department into patrol cars.

DR. KELLING: Yes.

MR. WUNSCH: As I read you, this pull derives from the fact that the police department is flooded with telephone calls. Is that correct?

DR. KELLING: Yes.

MR. WUNSCH: You went on to say that the quality of the phone calls was not up to standard, that there was something the matter with responding to a telephone call. Could you explain that a little?

DR. KELLING: The idea regarding rapid response to calls for service has always been that you could intercept a criminal immediately leaving the scene of a crime, that somehow you could effect an arrest because of a rapid response to calls for service. That was based on a misunderstanding of what victims do. Victims don't call the police first. Victims go through a process where they decide whether to call the police. Since most assaults - 70 or 80 percent of them are people that the victim knows - and since even many armed robberies, interestingly enough, are done by people settling private debts, people have decisions to make before they call the police. The result is, it was found, that citizens delay up to 20 to 40 minutes to call the police. What we have then is an emergency response system where the police go as rapidly as they can to the call for service, they abandon other activities, they shorten other activities so they can be available; but there is little possibility that that is going to make any difference.

The result is that more and more of a police officer's time is committed to calls for service. That police officer has no time to spend with citizens. He can't investigate a crime properly. A patrol officer can't investigate many crimes because he is supposed to get to the scene, handle the situation as quickly as possible, and get back in his car and start moving around again.

Also, it is not just response to calls for service. Police officers have come to believe that the action is in riding in vehicles and police officers want to get back into those cars, drive around for that hoped for good call. And if you ride with officers, you can see the excitement that is generated by calls.

The belief in the efficacy of patrol cars is so powerful that officers are eager to get back in their cars and get ready for that next call. So there is that pull again, an organizational pull, from foot patrol. But the primary thing, especially as we get in 911 systems, is we make it easier and easier to demand immediate response to calls for service. As we advertise, in effect, what happens is the police get overwhelmed by this.

MR. WUNSCH: Are you suggesting that we make it harder to call the police?

DR. KELLING: I am not suggesting that we make it harder. What I am suggesting is that we have to find additional ways to deal with those calls rather than just sending a car. There are many cases that can be counselled by telephone. In many cases, an officer can be sent the next day. If a house has been burglarized while a person has been on vacation and the person comes home and finds it burglarized, you don't need a car there in three minutes. You can schedule an appointment and send an officer there. By no means am I trying to suggest that the police be insensitive. What I am saying is that efficient use of officer power suggests that telephone calls can be handled more efficiently.

MR. WUNSCH: Can a walking patrolman respond to a telephone call?

DR. KELLING: Yes. Given the fact that you assume that very few calls are really emergencies, there is no reason why walking officers can't walk to a call for service and handle it very satisfactorily.

MR. WUNSCH: One final question. I know in research you don't like to anticipate conclusions.

DR. KELLING: Yes.

MR. WUNSCH: This committee will be obliged to report early next year to the Appropriations Committee on the efficacy of this program. Will your report provide additional data as to the effect of walking patrolmen on the crime rate, anything tangible and useful?

DR. KELLING: Yes. We are doing victimization surveys. We are serving business people. We are using reported crime. We are interviewing citizens that use the streets as well as residents. It is a very expensive and very complex evaluation. It is going to cost the foundation about \$400,000.

MR. WUNSCH: You said though that the present reports and studies are inconclusive. Can you tell us that your report will be conclusive?

DR. KELLING: The report will be conclusive. Let me put it this way: I think the report will hedge and I think we are going to find areas where foot patrol works and areas where it doesn't. But if you look at the other things that we have published, we call it - we put it out there - and put it out there very strongly.

MR. WUNSCH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: This study will be completed June of '79.

DR. KELLING: June of '79, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: You are going to publish all of your facts and will the report be available?

DR. KELLING: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: How?

DR. KELLING: First of all, they will be circulated throughout the police agencies we are working with. We will get their comments, then redraft it, and it will be a public document, providing everyone agrees.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Doctor, I can't thank you enough. I know that this committee will be much richer as a result of the testimony that you presented.

DR. KELLING: Thank you. It has been a pleasure working in New Jersey.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: We will have one more witness before we break for lunch.

MR. WUNSCH: Barry Genesen, Coordinator, Safe and Clean Program, Jersey City.

B A R R Y G E N E S E N: The City of Jersey City has found the Safe and Clean Program to be extremely effective. As a direct result of the program's inception in 1973, the city placed 83 additional patrolmen on the police force. Presently, we have 58 patrolmen on the Safe Streets program, with an additional 9 supervisors. The reason that we have reduced the number of walking patrolmen on this particular program is because the funding has remained constant, while the salaries, pension benefits, etc. for patrolmen have gone up. However, we do have walking patrolmen in the city who are not funded directly by the Safe Streets Program.

Concerning the administration of the Safe component, Jersey City believes in the effectiveness of the walking patrol. We use the walking patrol outside the Safe Streets Program. As Dr. Kelling stated, I can't present you with data in terms of the effectiveness of the program. In fact, I asked Dr. Kelling a while ago if he had any data concerning the effectiveness of Jersey City's foot patrol, because I knew they were engaged in the study. However, he informed me that they had not arrived at any conclusions.

However, it is extremely effective in terms of the perception of safety by the merchants and shoppers in our commercial areas where our Safe Streets patrolmen are primarily used. Let me give you one example. We have a commercial rehabilitation project underway on Martin Luther King Drive in Jersey City. The redevelopment involves sidewalks, trees, etc., etc. One of the essential components of the program was the provision of two walking patrolmen for this area. The principal planner in charge of that program was extremely active in lobbying for those additional patrolmen. They have been extremely useful.

As to the Clean portion of the program, we use our money for demolition, purchase of sanitation equipment, park rehab, park construction, tree plantings, street light improvement and some other things. In light of the fiscal crisis facing Jersey City, the program is most important. While we have a fiscal crisis, at the same time we also are faced with increasing service demands and maintenance of parks, streets, sidewalks, street lighting, etc., etc. We find that the Clean portion has been very useful in producing some programs which I believe would not have come about without this particular program. For example, through the years we have had the program, we have provided 900 concrete litter containers on the streets of Jersey City in the various commercial districts. I am told by our sanitation people that they collect approximately 5 tons of litter per day. That is a lot of litter that would otherwise have been on the street.

We are rehabilitating a park in the Country Village section of Jersey City. The Safe and Clean Program completely funded night lighting for that park, which provides 25,000 additional hours of recreation opportunity in an area which is starved for recreation opportunities.

Additionally, we have utilized Safe and Clean funds very effectively to supplement Greenacres funds. For example, we found in several park projects that, when they were estimated, they would perhaps come in at estimates of \$50,000 and be funded on that basis. However, by the time they get out to bids or by the time Greenacres funding is available, because you cannot work on two or three projects at the same time, the price has considerably escalated. Without Safe and Clean funds, a number of these projects would not have gone forward.

In conclusion, let me state our feeling that the program is most effective. We feel that we have great flexibility and control over the level of patrol, the areas to be patrolled, and the type of Clean projects that we have.

I would point out, however, that while the funding for the program has remained constant, the costs involved certainly have not. Police salaries have, of course, increased since 1973. As you may be aware, construction prices vary from day to day it seems. Recently the city put out for bids on street-sweepers. In August, I believe, the bid came in at \$42,000. In September, the same street-sweeper cost \$45,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Mr. Genesen, I want to thank you for appearing. Since you come from Jersey City, which has so many problems, it would have been nice to have spent considerable more time with you.

I have no questions.

MR. GENESEN: Sir, I have Sergeant Sabo, who is in charge of the Safe aspect of the program with me if you do have any questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: So that we give everybody a fair opportunity to be heard, can we put him on this afternoon after lunch?

MR. GENESEN: I just brought him to answer any questions you might have.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: First, let us find out if any members of the committee have any questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: I have no questions concerning the Safe portion. I just want to point out again, without a question, my concern about the \$60,000 of discretionary grants for areas I feel are not related to Safe. That's all.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Edwards?

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: No questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: May I ask just one question? Mayor, what percentage of foot patrolmen do you have under the Clean and Safe Act and what percentage do you normally maintain under your regular patrol?

MR. GENESEN: We have 58 patrolmen on the Safe Streets Program. We put out 32 Safe Streets Patrolmen per day.

MR. SABO: Approximately 85 percent is Safe Streets.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Eighty-five percent of your total is Safe Streets?

MR. SABO: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: There are no further questions. Thank you. We will adjourn until 1:30 P.M.

(Recess for Lunch.)

Afternoon Session

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The second portion of this hearing will now begin. Our first witness will be called by the Aide to our Committee.

MR. WUNSCH: Patricia Sheehan, Commissioner of the Department of Community Affairs.

PATRICIA SHEEHAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

I don't have a prepared statement because I know that when your hearings opened, Mr. Barry Skokowski from our department was able to spend a longer period of time with you and go into some detail on the Safe and Clean Program.

Basically, what I would like to say today is, one, a very strong endorsement for the program. I think we have all in recent months heard much about urban policy and partnership. And I am rather proud of the fact that long before they became popular sayings, the Safe and Clean Program perhaps more than any other program was, in fact, a partnership program with the urban aid municipalities, and also one that directs its attention in a logical, reasonable and planned fashion to neighborhood improvement, the quality of life in our urban areas and, probably the need most basic to all of us, a sense of security and well-being.

The department, I think, can be proud - and I certainly am proud in their behalf - of the administration of the program. I know that you have had an opportunity to hear from many of the mayors and law enforcement personnel that work with this program on a daily basis. I believe that the reports that they have been able to make to you substantiate not only the justification and the need for such a program, but an enforcement of that approach whereby municipal governments and State government share together both the responsibility and the goal of something that is very basic to our citizens.

I would be happy to attempt to answer any questions that you might have.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you, Commissioner. As usual, you have given us a very excellent report.

I would like to ask a few questions. One of the questions that has been bothering me most - and I did hear some answers last week, but I would like some clarification from you - is: Where is the money coming from to operate this program?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: There is a \$12 million appropriation, Assemblyman; and that is State appropriated funds. The balance of that is matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the individual municipalities.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I really was referring to the administrative part of the Clean and Safe Streets Program.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: You mean within the Department. As you know, through the Joint Appropriations Committee, the money that we had been using as so-called administrative money was excluded from the budget. That, of course, as with any cut makes for some difficulty in an operating agency.

Our response to that - again although difficult is one I am somewhat proud of - is a reorganization within the Department and within this particular Division to, in effect, almost require people to do double duty and additional work. We have in following the thrust of organizing ourselves within State

government, which I think is an ongoing responsibility, with ever diminishing resources and ever increasing responsibilities, within the Division of Local Government Services, what we call an Urban Strategies Unit. We have attempted to bring together the personnel that has the experience and technical background with our urban aid programs generally, so that the basic movement of the paper goes on, but, more particularly, the evaluation, the cooperative program planning and review take place. So it is with mirrors. I suppose that is the most basic answer.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Well, the Committee has heard wonderful things on the Safe part of the program. But there have been some questions on the Clean part. Some of the members of the Committee are concerned about the discretionary part of it, what it is being used for and why at this time is it being used for some things that may be readily available by other departments or federal funds. Can you comment on that at all?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I certainly can. And I would have to admit to you that some of my bias in my remarks stems from my own experience as a mayor in an urban-aid community, utilizing, I hope wisely and well in those days, Safe and Clean moneys. The Clean component I think is an integral part of the program, particularly when we look at it in the context, if you will, of our neighborhood preservation efforts generally. It is an opportunity as well as a challenge, because again there are shared costs, for a municipality to target a special need in a particular designated area or component that results in a more safe, more secure, and more pleasant environment.

I think it is the targeting, the coordinative approach, to do in some instances almost basic services, but in many more instance something a little bit beyond the basic, basic service, to as an end result have a better and more secure neighborhood. So they tie together very, very importantly, I think.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Were there any guidelines or criteria on how the Clean phase of the program should be handled? Is there anything that it cannot do, anything that the city cannot use that Clean money for?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Let me say as an overview that in each instance for either the Safe or the Clean, there is not only an ongoing, day-in-and-day-out kind of contact with the municipality, but there is a regular proposal negotiation stage. So the individual municipality really has a chance to propose whatever it sees as its best and greatest need. We, in turn, at the State level have a chance to evaluate that in terms of how it will follow the legislative mandate of the program.

Specifically, the funds can be used to a limited degree for some capital equipment. They may purchase some other minor equipment to tie in with the proposal at hand. And there is some demolition that would be permitted if that were the community's need and priority at the moment. Relocation expenses are not eligible. And I am sure there are probably several other caveats that don't come to my mind at the moment. I think the important thing is to take it in the context of almost a negotiating session as to how it will best fit the legislative mandate under which we are working.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: One further question and then I will pass the questioning on to the Committee. One of my concerns was that parks are generally included, that is, open space where there is Greenacre money and federal money involved. Do you feel that the Clean part of the program should

be used for those things, for which they can receive money from other sources?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I think so, Assemblyman, because in any program, no matter how good it is or how effective it is, it could always do more. There are limitations. There are priorities. There are winners and losers in the grant business, whatever the project happens to be. What we have done - and if it has not already been made available to you, I know Mr. Skokowski would make it available to you - is continue from the day one of the Safe and Clean Program, if you will, an inventory of the kinds of equipment or kinds of expenditures that have been made under this program. And you are right; there are instances where that has been for a particular park improvement. But I think you would find as you looked at them, not only on day one but what they look like two or three years later, that we are really talking in the truest sense of the word of vest pocket, mini-park, neighborhood facilities. In many instances, although the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation or various historical preservation programs or our own State Greenacres has funds for the same general parks, nonetheless, by and large, they are more significant or more substantial in the open space area than they are in terms of neighborhood utilization. I think, at least in the experience of the ones I have actually seen and visited in a before-and-after situation, it has been used for the removal of an eyesore, the removal of a place that has been badly vandalized or abandoned or a hang-out for youngsters that has caused a problem in the neighborhood in terms of muggings and other such problems that we have had from time to time. The removal of that eyesore or that blight or that source of potential crime and the replacement by this little park or green space fit within the overall Safe and Clean aspect. Frankly, given the demands for the Greenacres Program, I would just guess or be fearful that it would never quite reach the priority that was necessary or serve the overall, larger context of regional need that we see in most of the Greenacres activities.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: One thought crossed my mind. This seems to be from all the evidence we have collected probably one of the most successful programs in the State.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: That is wonderful to hear, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I am wondering whether at any point in time one of your successors might make this a permanent program.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I would certainly hope so. I think there is some precedent for that because, as you know, this year for the first time the Urban Aid Program was built in as a permanent program. Up to now, each year there was a scramble on the part of both the administration and the Legislature to get the appropriate pieces in place at a time far enough ahead that the local municipalities could benefit by that in preparing their own budgets and their own spending programs for the forthcoming year.

Speaking for local governments generally, the more advanced and the more firm their knowledge is in terms of potential financing, the more ability they then have to make appropriate planning in terms of their priorities and also in terms of agonizing, as they must, over their individual budgets. So having in effect institutionalized urban aid this year, certainly I would think that it might be possible, given the interest of the Legislature and

Governor Byrne, to indeed institutionalize Safe and Clean as well. The only caveat I would hold on that is, again speaking more for local municipalities than for State government, that it is very difficult to assume that something is in hand because it has been institutionalized if, in fact, it is not funded. And if it were not to be funded, then I think institutionalizing it engages us all in a game that we would be better off not participating in.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I want to thank you for your candor.

Assemblyman Costello, do you have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: Commissioner, I must confess that your comments, along with those of people who preceded you, cause me to become perhaps less concerned about some of the reservations I may have had. But I still must go back to my original concern that prompted me to ask the questions a few weeks ago, namely, that the communities that can qualify for this Safe and Clean Program are those that qualify for Urban Aid. That is the principal qualification that they be in that category. Now we are also going to grant them x number of dollars under these other programs. I believe New Brunswick was a recipient of some of these moneys so you know the benefit to be derived from it.

I also question the original intent of the law. I have no qualms whatsoever with the Safe aspects of this act. Conceivably, I could go back to Trenton tomorrow and vote to increase it and make permanent the Safe aspects of this. But I have serious reservations about offering these towns a second go-around, so to speak, on moneys that they hopefully can apply for and compete with 567 or 560 other communities, whatever the number may be - namely, Greenacres. Granted, a mini-park would enhance an area. But I fail to see how this could qualify under the Safe and Clean Street Program. Our prime concern is the Safe portion. I will agree that the demolition of old buildings is an absolute must. If they cannot be rehabilitated, they should come down because they do present problems in a community.

I am concerned when I read in the allocations money spent to fill potholes for street improvements. These moneys previously came from a program that before my time in Trenton was dropped; and that was aid to road programs for the municipalities.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: State aide to municipalities and counties.

ASSEMBLYMAN COSTELLO: They have found a way of circumventing that and using these moneys. There are other communities that perhaps cannot qualify under the overall concept of the Safe and Clean Streets Act, but now perhaps could share in this eight hundred some thousand dollars of discretionary funds. I realize it has been reduced considerably. Now they could qualify for some of the items that could be used for Safe Streets, whether it be walkie-talkies or one more police car or whatever. They are not eligible because they are not urban aid communities.

I would prefer that we have a re-evaluation of this whole thing and make all the elements of the Safe portion available to more communities rather than getting involved in what I said to Ozzie and the other members of the committee I think is twisting the law a little bit, so as to make them eligible for filling potholes, building parks, paying architectural fees, and buying trucks not related to Safe and Clean Streets.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to that

in several different ways.

I don't think that there is any question that there are a variety of needs in many of our municipalities that aren't being met, either because of inadequate State funding or inadequate local or county funding. I know certainly after last winter, I like, I guess, anyone else who was in New Jersey recognize that we have road problems in county, local and State roads with potholes and the rest of it. I think that has to be addressed, but in a way designated to face up to that problem. Which level of government and what amount of resources are we willing to allocate to the road problem?

I think though when you look at this program in terms of a road improvement program or a park development program, you are --- it is difficult for me to pick the appropriate phraseology here --- I think you want to look at this program as a piece complete not in and of itself to the exclusion of anything else that happens in the community. Don't misunderstand me because I think a very important part is the communication and the coordination and the shared responsibilities. But, nonetheless, if you focus on the original intent of the legislation - and obviously, if it is the will of the Legislature, that can be changed at any time --- But I think rather than focus on Safe versus Clean or Safe or Clean, you really want to focus on "Neighborhood." And what we were talking about then is the concern that all of us share, not only those of us like myself who live in an urban center, but all of us who have a public responsibility in this State; and, that is, both the actuality and the perception of life in the city neighborhoods, in the urban centers, of our State.

When we say Safe and Clean Neighborhood, I would suggest and hope that the focus could be on the neighborhood and that it is not an either-or proposition; but rather they relate to each other, not to solve a larger problem in terms of the conditions of roads within a given community or the condition of the public buildings, or even the historical preservation efforts that they want to take on, or the sewer or the water problems. The focus here is on the environment in the largest sense of the word, the quality of life and the security of a city neighborhood. I really suggest that at least to some limited degree, with very limited resources - and any appropriation that has stayed level over a certain length of time has, in effect, reduced significantly -- nonetheless, with a very limited resource, to accomplish that kind of a goal, you have to focus on the whole. I would prefer certainly that it not be taken as a Safe versus Clean, or a Safe or Clean, but rather a security neighborhood qualify of life program.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCIA: Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Commissioner, we heard some testimony before from a couple of new municipalities that have been added to the program because they have been added to the Urban Aid Program. There are three of them that have not been funded. What is your department or the Governor's proposal with reference to handling those new municipalities under present funding? One gentleman indicated that it was the Governor's intention to spread the money out that was already there and reallocate it among all 31 urban areas, as opposed to the existing 28. Is that accurate?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: There was no additional funding with the addition of the three towns. Two things should be noted in that regard because there was some mention earlier of discretionary moneys. There was a time in the early stages of the program where many communities for a variety of reasons, generally a lack of their own resources as much as anything else, did not participate to the full maximum under the formula in the law. So there was a balance that allowed for some discretionary, one-shot special funding. That is not possible anymore. As a matter of fact, if the 28 communities within the eligibility received their full grant, the appropriation should have been \$691,694 above the \$12 million. So at the current time with the legislation and the funding in place, there are frankly three communities that will not be funded under this law because the appropriation is not there.

Whether the Legislature and the Appropriations Committee and the Budget Bureau and the Governor make some changes in that in the course of this year with a supplemental or what have you, I am not aware of that activity at the moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: What would be your recommendation as to what we should be doing with this, on behalf of the Executive Branch, with reference to that particular problem we are faced with, which is part of our hearing, whether it be in this fiscal year or next fiscal year?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Well, Assemblyman, I have to tell you that I subscribe to the goal - I hope it is more than a theory - of full funding. Really, that is what I was indicating by my remark to the Chairman. I think it is very difficult for a State agency or a local municipality to expect because the law says x that x will be forthcoming, and then the appropriation is somewhat shy or short of x. It seems to me that the Legislature - and this is just a personal opinion - would be better served to amend the law to match the dollars they are willing to put to that law, whatever the law happened to be. You know, either full funding or not full funding. But don't say full funding in the law and then not appropriate enough money.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: So your recommendation then would be to appropriate the full funding?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Would it be your concurrent recommendation, since you obviously placed an emphasis on the joint neighborhood rehabilitation aspects of Safe and Clean - this refers to the Assemblyman's previous question - that we take this money maybe from existing Urban Aid funds and add it to this particular program as having a priority over existing Urban Aid dollars.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: No. As a former mayor of a center city, I could not in any way suggest or go on record for a reduction in the Urban Aid funds. I think that they have placed New Jersey in an up-front, forward, responsible position in terms of what nationally is becoming a question of urban policy, urban housing policy, urban land-use policy, urban whatever. Urban Aid funds serve, if you will, as New Jersey's general revenue-sharing to the center cities who have not only the largest numbers of people, but the largest numbers of problems and the least resources of their own. I think that we can be justly proud of the Legislature and the number of governors that have placed urban aid

support as a priority item. And I could not suggest that that be diminished.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Then you don't have any real suggestions as to where we could come up with the additional dollars to assist urban areas. My basic concern is that we are saying we have these 31 urban areas. We are saying and have said in the past they deserve additional dollars because of the unique problems that they have. We have defined Safe and Clean as a unique problem. Yet we have not included that within the overall urban aid allocations. We have decided to come up with a separate bill. Should it not be considered in that area with those funds as part of the total urban aid package? Or should we spin off the Clean aspect into Greenacres; or should we reinstate municipal road aid programs as the various alternatives to the Clean aspects? We are saying in this particular case we are giving the 31 urban aid municipalities more money in addition for this specific program because we think we want the program implemented in this way; we don't want the dollars spent to be discretionary as they are in other areas sometimes. In doing that, should we not be calculating that into the total urban aid package and just make it a segment of urban aid rather than a separate Safe and Clean?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I think Safe and Clean should stand on its own as a separate package because, as I say, the thrust on the neighborhood, I think, makes it unique. All I meant to suggest was that at the time it was expanded from 24 to 28 - and I have to admit to you that I go back to the time when only the big six in our State received funds --- each time there has been an expansion, that is the time to suggest whether it be fully funded or not. To add towns without adding funding, I think is an inappropriate way to go. But that is just a personal opinion.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I agree with you. I couldn't agree with you any more. We are either going to fund it properly or reduce the scope of the legislation. I think that is one of the discussions that is going on here with reference to the Clean aspect, as to its integral nature and should we or should we not be doing that. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner, you mentioned the administration costs. I think the Chairman alluded to those in his opening remarks. As we all know, we are bitten by inflation and also the fiscal crunch which we are experiencing throughout the nation and throughout the State and all our communities. Is it your intention, if no funds come forward in your budget for administration purposes of this program, to still give it a high priority?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: In other words, you will follow the same route you followed this year and stay with the program and find ways to implement it?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: To the best of our ability, yes, sir. I think it is that critical a program.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: We have heard testimony that it is working very well, it has been well received and the Department has done a good job in administering it. I just don't want to see that atmosphere deteriorate. We take you at your word that you are going to keep on with the program and I think that this is

very meaningful to this committee.

Your concept of the entire neighborhood being what this program is all about is granted. But my question is: In fact, when you evaluate the Safe and the Clean portions of an application, are they tied together pretty much in your evaluation or are you evaluating the Clean portion and the Safe portion in separate ways? In other words, what I am asking is: When an application comes in for six walking patrolmen and a mini-park, do they normally dovetail together in a given area, or are they anyplace in the municipality?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Yes, they dovetail. It may be, for example, that a particular mini-park or a capital program of whatever description does not fit in all of the neighborhoods. But they do tie together in that the Clean activity, if you can call it that, relates to the Safe posts that are established within the community.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: That was the question I wanted clarified for my own information.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I tried to stress that earlier. I think it is very important to keep that in mind. We have all been guilty of thinking, "Well, I'm doing X on this side of town; I had better do Y on that side of town." Or, "We will scatter a little dibble hither and thither and hope that with this glue and bandaid that we have solved the problem." What we attempt to do within this program is, to use one of the new bureaucrat's favorite words, target the resources and very carefully try to consider the relationship between the Safe posts, if you will, and the designated neighborhoods.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Girgenti.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: Commissioner, may I say I am very impressed with the program from what I have heard today plus what I have heard in the past, and also, your presentation. I only have one problem. I remember, going back about six months when we were in session, there was a recommendation brought up - now I don't know whether it was through the administration or a legislative committee - that we were going to expand and add three new urban aid municipalities and the money was going to be spread out to all of them, including the new three. At that point, I was definitely opposed and I know the other people in our delegation were because that would mean moneys would come out of areas, such as Paterson, Newark and Passaic; and we are trying to head in the other direction with this program, based on what we have heard here. Where are we going to go with this program in terms of your personal recommendations? Hopefully, we will be able to fund the three additional municipalities in the future. But you as the Commissioner must have objectives and goals in terms of this program. Where do you want to head with it? And how are you going to be able to do it with the limitation in funding?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I don't think there is any way I could answer that question. In the last several years, each year I think, well, next year the budget crisis, the tax crisis, or whatever, will be behind us and we will kind of struggle through this year. That next year never comes. I have stopped saying things are so bad, they will get better, because there is always a way that they can get worse one way or another.

There is no doubt in my mind and I think it is clear, as you know, that

each department head is under very tight direction, if you will, by the State Treasurer not only to reduce our requests for next year, but to reduce within the actual budgets that are appropriated right at this moment. There just isn't money around for new programs. The prospects of that happening very soon - I can't find them on my horizon.

What I think that means for all of us, both administrators and legislators, is that we have to look at where the money is already going and see how wisely or well it is being used, or how it can be improved upon. But I think as legislators, you have to keep in mind - and I am speaking only for my own department, but I am sure it is true of others - that each year as you continue to suggest responsibilities to us, there is always a little bit more you can do without some more funding. But you reach the end of that road. There comes a point where a two, three, four and five times increase in responsibilities just doesn't work anymore. That is a charge and a responsibility we all have to face. I think I have a responsibility to attempt to be an advocate for the 567 municipalities in this State and for the 21 county governments. And I attempt to serve their needs and be a spokesman for the needs of municipal and county governments. But I think, as well, that one of my biases is the particular needs of the urban areas.

I was asked a little bit earlier about urban aid and now am being asked about Safe and Clean. I think those are priority items in terms of the needs, the desires and the responsibilities of the cities of this State. Because I think urban America is great and I live in a city is not to suggest that there aren't other areas of the State and other good citizens in very great need. And I attempt to represent them. But the environment in the broadest sense of the word, to repeat myself - and I don't mean to do that - and the livability of the cities in New Jersey I think is a priority item for all of us. I think it is as important to us who live in the cities as it is to those who live in the most remote or pristine or rural areas of our State, because I think what hurts us in downtown Paterson hurts us wherever we live.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I think part of what this is all about, this hearing, and so forth, is that at some point you are, as you say, working within a limit and the value of the money has gone down because of inflation. The problem, as Mayor Kramer mentioned before, is that we would like to see the program opened up to all the municipalities in the future. We are talking especially about the area of crime. If you have to prioritize in the end and decide within a limited budget whether you are going to continue with certain projects that Herman talked about throughout this hearing, or putting patrolmen on the street, which we have heard has been very effective, where would that priority be? I think that decision is coming down the road in a short period of time unless we come up with a lot of money, and I don't see that happening.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I don't have an answer for you on that today, Assemblyman, but I can tell you what we do - and we take it very seriously within our department and it isn't pleasant; it is a very agonizing experience -- but what we do within our department is that each of the divisions prepares its proposals for its budget. It is very frustrating to them and I know it is heart-breaking for me to say, "Well, forget about the new and great ideas and different things you would like to do because the resources aren't going to be there for great big

new programs. But prepare your budgets and be as tight with them as you can." That is then evaluated by myself and the Assistant Commissioners and the Director of Administration within our department, and we rank them. It isn't fun and it isn't easy. I am not really sure we do the best we could do, but we try. That goes down the street to your end of town. This is what we mean by zero-based budgeting. As the Budget Bureau makes cuts, we are now on record. We have made a determination and we have picked one over two, two over ten, and so on and so forth. That is what we are going through right now. So there comes a time when the budget faces you and your judgment. Then you have got us. We are not picking between things we would like to do and things we have to do. We are picking between things that should be done. And where do you eliminate? We will have that record for you. It is not an easy one to compile and I am never too happy with it. But that will be available. That is the agony we are in at the moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I thank you very much and I commend you on your testimony.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Before I excuse you, Commissioner, there is one thing on my mind. The ultimate result of these hearings is obviously going to be a recommendation by this committee. Of course, that recommendation would have to deal with the budget part of it and we would have to make a recommendation to the Appropriation Committee to cover what we want to do. We heard some testimony today, especially by Mayor Kramer, that perhaps there are other programs that are not as efficient and not as effective as this particular program seems to be. Could you during the short period of time remaining that we are going to have you - and I hope we have you forever - give us some information on some of these other programs that we might look into where there are overlapping operations between this program and those programs?

COMM'R SHEEHAN: I certainly would be happy to cooperate with the committee in any way. I can tell you from our vantage point, at least, we attempt not to duplicate or overlap but to coordinate or fill in the missing links and pieces. As I say, I would have staff available to respond to any questions. But, off the top of my head, I can't think of any. Where there might have been in years past duplication and discretionary pots, and all those kinds of goodies, I have never been around when they were available. Mostly, I have learned how to cut, postpone, defer and eliminate. So I don't have any answer for you right now, but I would be happy to work with the committee on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: When this committee starts setting up workshops in preparation for submitting our report, I may very well call on people from your department to come in and help us on some of these things.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Certainly.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I want to thank you very much for being here today, and I hope the rumors I hear about you aren't true. I hope you stay with us forever.

COMM'R SHEEHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WUNSCH: Senator Frank Graves from Paterson.

SENATOR FRANK X. GRAVES, JR.: Fellow legislators, I think the impact of this program and its good results have been expressed by the Mayor of this city in this morning's testimony.

As a legislator, I must say that I, like you, don't want to see some people benefit to a greater degree from State funding than others. But let me in my five minutes transmit to you the necessity for this program.

I consider this program one of the most effective State programs ever offered to municipalities, because I believe that it touches more people's lives and has more effect on the services that a municipality can provide than other State programs that are available.

If it weren't for the Safe and Clean Streets Program, we would probably have 30 to 40 less Policemen in the City of Paterson. We are talking about 10 percent of our total Police Department. This program also has benefitted the Department of Public Works, Division of Recreation. Unlike, suburban communities, municipalities such as Paterson have a problem that was forced on them many years ago by the federal government. That problem relates to low-cost housing.

Providing a decent environment in which people could live was part of the goal of Congress and our President maybe 20 or 25 years ago. The City of Paterson hasn't built a low-cost housing project since the 1950's other than for senior citizens. But the City of Paterson is a prime example of what the federal government can do, not necessarily to ruin a municipality, but to make the lives of about a thousand citizens in our city difficult. I am talking about two projects in the City of Paterson, one called the Christopher Columbus and the other called the Alabama Avenue Project. Each one of these projects which were sponsored by the federal government houses 500 families. Each one of these projects is built on a limited amount of ground that no planning or zoning regulation would ever permit today. There is an incredible lack of decent recreational facilities for the people who live in them. Of our population of 150 thousand, I am talking about a thousand families who live in these two high-rise projects brought to us by the federal government. Each of these projects has approximately 1,350 youngsters living in it with no decent recreational facilities. They are shuttled to different schools because there is no one school that can service all of the young people from those two particular projects. Maybe some other people in the municipality are concerned by their presence there. But I am more concerned about the people who live in these conditions, although I am aware of some of the problems that might be created in neighborhood facilities, etc.

So this forces us to provide services which we must pay for by tax dollars on an unequal basis. It means that others must shoulder the responsibilities, because we will probably find that most of these children are in the Aid to Dependent Children Program. It might not be known to you, but upwards of eight thousand children in the City of Paterson are on Aid to Dependent Children. It means that we have these problems that suburbia doesn't even know exist. But yet, we must treat our people the same as they do in suburbia. In the last five years, the City of Paterson has struck and struck hard to bring suburbia to our municipality. We built recreational fields. We built tennis courts. We built midget ball fields. We have even built bocci courts. And we have done everything we can to bring green space to the various neighborhoods so they

could have some of the things that Wycoff or North Haledon or other municipalities in suburbia could offer them. But we could not have afforded these things in our structure of taxation if it had not been for the Safe and Clean Streets Act that the State of New Jersey enacted, I believe, approximately seven years ago.

The continuation of this program is more necessary and more vital to municipalities such as the city in which you find yourself, which is playing host to you today, than practically any other program that we could talk about here today that the Legislature has implemented.

So, as a Senator, I beg you to continue it. It is needed and it has enjoyed a remarkable degree of success. It is well monitored by the State. Because of this monitoring, it keeps the municipalities on their toes and ensures that there is no drifting.

We have seen a slight difference of opinion between the Mayor of this city and the Council President of this city as to the regulation with regard to walking patrolmen. I have a deep concern for public safety because of my affiliation with public safety. At times, we have had to park a police car at headquarters - yet we had an ample number of men and women walking the beats of the City of Paterson - when that police car might have been instrumental in saving someone's life because of the equipment it contains. But we couldn't use that car and reassign a walking patrol person to it because of the regulations and the fact that we might be monitored that particular day. And I might say we are monitored quite aggressively. We can't feel, "Well, you have checked us today; you won't be back to monitor us again for a month or two." The fact is you might monitor us on a Wednesday and be back on Saturday monitoring us again. We want it that way. But I do believe that there should be some discretion given to the Chief of Police other than just on an emergency basis, so that when he feels in his wisdom as a professional that he needs to divert some of his troops in another direction, he can do it, as long as he doesn't do it more than 25 percent of the time. I don't mean that the 25 percent would erode the 100 percent that we are now given.

Now we have been able to use the little scooters with a marked degree of success, especially at certain times of the year in certain types of weather. The policemen who were signed to them were accessible and visible to the public. Incidentally, I hope before you leave the City of Paterson you will see some of the walking patrol people. We not only have men walking these posts, but we have police women as well. We have some CETA policemen in the City of Paterson. The only reason we have them is because Civil Service hasn't given us a list from which to appoint regular policemen. We try to stay away from CETA policemen because we want professionalism. Some municipalities, in my estimation, are taking one hell of a calculated risk by having one-third of their departments under CETA because, if the program ever collapses or if the program that Congress probably will adopt this week is passed, placing a cap on the dollars and cents that will be given and, more importantly, limiting the time which they can serve - I think a year and a half is going to be the maximum limit and \$12,000 will be the maximum salary permitted - they are going to have quite a problem.

So the program that you are reviewing here today in this public hearing works well. It is an aggressive program; it is a needed program. The results

of this program can be seen everywhere.

I heard some questioning about money being used for demolition. Probably no other city in the State has as aggressive a demolition program as the City of Paterson, because we have seen what happens in other cities. New York is a prime example of it. When the President made a tour there about a year and a half ago, we saw on television what he witnessed. There is nothing that will work quicker to deteriorate a neighborhood than an abandoned building because the person who lives next to it, on the other side of the street or behind it is not going to spend any of his money or borrow any money to fix his own house. As a matter of fact, he will not be able to borrow any money for that purpose as long as that abandoned structure remains.

We have demolished a staggering number of buildings, almost 600 structures, in the City of Paterson since the present government has been functioning. That number represents more than 50 percent of the total number of structures in the community of Prospect Park, which is our nearest neighbor. And some of these structures that I am talking about housed not one or two people, but some of them housed as many as 100 people. The demolition program has been necessary and I think it has been a success.

Some critics have said we turned many parts of our city into empty lots. I would rather have that criticism than having an abandoned building standing that could be an attractive nuisance, becoming the scene of the taking of the life of some young girl on her way home from school or some young boy on his way home from school, or tying up our Fire Department in a multiple-alarm fire for hours when they might be someplace else. We have seen both things happen as the result of not ridding a city of these abandoned homes.

The Safe and Clean Streets Program has been instrumental and helpful in this, and also in cleaning up the lots, in bringing recreation that we otherwise couldn't have afforded, and in addition 30 or 40 policemen that we could not readily have afforded in our budget.

So I would say, the governing body of the third largest city of this State is of the opinion that this is a remarkable program and, without it, the advancements that our city has made could never have been achieved.

As a legislator, I believe the program has to be expanded and I believe other areas of funding must be forthcoming. I don't mind taxation when I can see as a result something is able to be done that helps soften the load for the property owner, because if there is one thing that all of us must work for, it is to reduce property taxes so as to make city living attractive once again. There is hardly a home for sale in this city, as you will see if you drive through our residential streets. When you do see a "for sale" sign go up, you usually see within a period of three weeks it is plastered over with a "sold" sign. And this program has played a vital role in all of these things.

I urge you to do whatever needs to be done to expand this program and, by no means, ever consider curtailing it. It is an aggressive program. It is a program that was piloted some seven years ago and its remarkable success can't be duplicated in any other program that comes to my mind. We, in Paterson, need it; and we, in Paterson, have been part of making it a successful program.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Senator, I will address you as Council President because we are in the City Hall and some of the questions I would like to ask deal with the municipality.

You and, I believe, one other mayor who testified advocated that some of these walking patrolmen be used in automobiles. You spoke about the CETA program and the number of people you had involved in it. If by some quirk of circumstance we lose the CETA Program, will we have the personnel in the City of Paterson to have the same number of walking patrolmen we have now; or would you of necessity have to put these walking patrolmen into cars?

SENATOR GRAVES: No. I would never be supportive of such a redeployment on a permanent 100 percent basis or even on a 50 percent basis, other than what is an emergency in the Chief's mind, not an emergency that might be only in our mind. We might consider as an emergency that fire we had here three months ago, Ozzie. You and I might consider that an emergency. The Police Chief might consider it an emergency when he has to park three police cars in front of headquarters and when one-fifth of our 15 patrol units is out of service at one time, and yet he has 35 men walking posts throughout the city. In that circumstance, it might be better if he had the right to redeploy three of those patrol persons into the other units to keep full mobility of our department. But I would not relax it beyond the point of permitting him on a professional basis to have that right of redeployment only up to 25 percent of the walking patrolmen.

Other than that, I agree with the Mayor that it might be a stepping stone toward the deterioration of this program to a point where departments might try to beg city councils and mayors to purposely lessen the effectiveness of walking patrolmen because of financial handicaps. We should never put ourselves in the position of deteriorating that program to the point where an unprofessional Chief of Police would be able to use this program in any way he pleased. Unless it is a real emergency, no walking patrolman should be reassigned on a temporary basis. I am just as vociferous as the mayor in his feeling on that matter. I would modify it in the way I have suggested only because I may have been in public safety a longer period of time than he was because his responsibilities were in one particular category and mine were in another.

So my feeling is that it has worked, and worked well, but a degree of flexibility should be given. It might be that certain mayors and council people don't want any part of that because they are afraid of the deterioration of the program. I still have some faith in the professionalism of the Chief of Police and believe that he would only reassign walking patrolmen if it were absolutely necessary.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: It is unusual that another person who testified today also referred to the tricycle. Can you explain to this committee in what way you think a tricycle squad would help the program, or would it help the program at all?

SENATOR GRAVES: Those three-wheel vehicles that you are alluding to are open on the front, back and side, except on inclement days when they pull isinglass curtains over them. With the Cushman scooter, he may be able to patrol ten straight blocks that he otherwise would only be able to walk 40

times, twice as many times or more.

We worry about giving a police officer the temptation to go off his post. That temptation is even greater since we have assigned every one of our walking patrolmen walkie-talkies. When you give them an assignment, you don't know whether they are responding inside a house or building or outside on the street. But with straight-line posts, we know that the supervisor has to be able to find them. If, after calling for a particular patrolman and not being able to find him for 15 minutes, then he knows the man is not on his post. With the scooter, it is pretty hard for them to hide.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: In essence what you are saying, that in our deliberations perhaps we should consider using some of these walking patrolmen in these so-called tricycles?

SENATOR GRAVES: Well, there are also the mopeds that are wide open.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Are you suggesting that we might give that some consideration?

SENATOR GRAVES: If something serious takes place in another part of town, one of the first things we do is reassign walking patrolmen from all over the city to that location, in order to keep our cars in service. Maybe 15 or 20 policemen will have to be deployed to the scene of the crime or the fire. Of course, if some of these patrolmen were on mopeds, they could be deployed more quickly than they could if they had to look for someone to give them a ride to another point in the city.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I think Mayor Kramer touched on this earlier this morning, but do you know how this has affected our crime rate over the past five years, for instance, or during the existence of this program? Do you have any figures on that?

SENATOR GRAVES: Both the Mayor and I were requested to appear before the Prosecutor three weeks ago, at which time he released to us, to the press, and to the public a staggering reduction in crime in this particular city. Now it is pretty hard to convince people that there is a reduction in crime because they feel some way or another figures are not presenting the truth.

There has been a reduction. Not too long ago, I would have been hesitant to see my daughter go down to Trenton Avenue, some four blocks from my home, and shop after dark. I don't now. I don't have any hesitancy if she asks to go down to Trenton Avenue shopping, or downtown, or on 21st Avenue. The only comment I might make is to ask her to pick up something I need. So I feel more relaxed and I think that is the general feeling of our citizens.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: What would you like to see done with this program in the future? Would you like to see it expanded?

SENATOR GRAVES: As a Senator, I believe that the program should be expanded. It should be funded so that there can be participation by more municipalities. I think it has gone way past the trial basis. I think it deserves more than a passing grade; I think it should receive a grade of 100 percent. There are not too many of us in government that can give

projects with which we are associated a passing grade. But there is no hesitancy on my part in saying that this is the most highly successful State program ever offered to the municipalities. We all know that the 576 municipalities can only do what the State permits them to do. They can't even put up a stop street sign, without the State's permission. They can't even create a bus stop without the State's permission. But this program is one that we can feel proud of. I think we have to find ways to expand it. We have to include more municipalities. It has helped solve our problems. If it has been successful in the third largest city of our State, what will it mean to some of the other cities that are getting older all the time?

ASSEMBLYMAN GIRGENTI: I tend to agree with you from what I have heard here today. I thank you very much for your presentation.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: You are excused, and thank you very much.

MR. WUNSCH: Detective Joseph King from Union.

P A U L K E L L Y: Mr. Chairman, I am not Detective King; I am Captain Paul Kelly of the Union City Police Department. Detective Joe King who is the coordinator of the Safe Streets Program between Union City and the State agency is sick. I am his immediate supervisor and our office administers the grant.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Welcome.

CAPTAIN KELLY: On my right is Sergeant Paul Hannick, one of our Safe Streets Supervisors.

In the letter that Detective Joe King received, it said, In preparing the testimony, you might consider the following: the tangible neighborhood benefits from the Safe component -- the Safe and Clean component -- but I am here speaking about the Safe component. We have had excellent results from the neighborhood concept. Having the patrolmen walking in the neighborhoods has given the people in these neighborhoods a feeling of security because they see the policemen walk around instead of seeing a car whiz by. The patrolman is instructed to meet with the people in the neighborhood, stop in places of business, tell the business people, "This is my post and I am here x number of days a week. My post is from here to there and you will see me coming by every hour," and be friendly with the people. This is something that hadn't been done for many years since the advent of the motor vehicle.

In Union City, we have used the walking patrolmen in what we consider rather unique ways. We have computerized many of our records in the city with the help of the State Law Enforcement Agency and with the help of the Department of Community Affairs. We can now more specifically pinpoint where much of our crime is being committed and assign the foot patrolmen to those areas by manpower allocation. We are using the foot patrolmen in those particular areas. We have areas where auto thefts were on the increase. We switched the walking patrolmen's posts to those areas where the theft of motor vehicles and parts was on the increase. Within a very short period of time, it was reduced.

We did a survey of breaking and entries which were plaguing the city. We found out through the use of a crime analyst that on the fringe of each Safe Street post, the breaking and entries were on the increase. But at the center of the post, they were not. We then moved the post a little bit and found

only on the fringe, a block or two beyond the point where the patrolman was walking, was the breaking and entering increasing. We then knew we had crime displacement. We were displacing it from where the walking patrolman was to where he was not. We continued to study and evaluate it and we decided to take another portion of the community and put more men in that area to see whether it would happen again in a larger square. The fact was that it did. The crime analyst at the present time is working with the Chief in order to determine the best posts for the reduction of crime, so we can have better manpower allocation. This has been ongoing now for almost two years. We have come up with what we think are some unique situations here. We are trying to evaluate them and make them better.

We have also trained our Safe Street personnel in crime prevention. Instead of having our policemen react after something happens, we are trying to get these foot policemen to "proact," to get involved in the community prior to crimes being committed.

At the present time, there are nine or ten at the Union County College receiving crime prevention training. Every one of the Safe Streets Patrolmen have received in-service training on crime prevention by myself, Detective King and Sergeant Hannick, specifically in the area of security surveys. We have assigned the Safe Streets Patrolmen to go into homes and go into businesses and, first of all, tell them that we have a Crime Prevention Bureau and ask if they are interested in having their places surveyed. They can tell them, "Your lock is inadequate here. Your windows are inadequate there, or your burglar alarm system is inadequate," and talk to them about hardening the target, making it more difficult for burglars to get in by reducing the opportunity. Then we are called and go down on that particular post on a day that that walking patrolman is there and do a security survey in the home with him or in the business. We make him an integral part of each one of the security surveys and he has input into what we send back to the individual. Then he follows up to evaluate how many suggestions we made to harden the target have been followed, which he reports back to the Crime Prevention Bureau.

Number three of your invitation asks: Is the program adequately coordinated with other State-aid programs? I specified just a few moments ago that the Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program has given us the opportunity to use some discretionary funds to acquire computer equipment in order to allocate this manpower. They have also given us the opportunity to use discretionary funds to construct a new citizens' alert system in the city. We now have a phone-box call system throughout the entire city - an emergency voice call-box system. It is replacing the old fire system and replacing the calling to headquarters for police in emergencies. There are 144 telephones in direct hookup with our police station. The program has funded this, along with funding from other agencies.

We have had very good success in using Safe and Clean money, along with the money of other agencies, to accomplish a particular goal.

Number two is: Specific problems encountered in the administration of the program - for example, is the Police Chief given sufficient flexibility in control over the walking patrolmen? To comment on what the Senator said before about utilizing the foot patrolmen in emergency situations, under the Safe

and Clean Program, you can use them in an emergency situation. We have asked them, "What do you consider an emergency situation?" They have indicated it would be something rather catastrophic, not just the fact that you do not have enough men for one particular shift. They feel that is an administrative problem and not the Program's problem. I have to believe that is true. Given a choice of administratively not having a sufficient number of men and keeping them on the street, I think most every Chief would say, "I am going to fill up my cars and put them out on the street." The Senator suggested limiting this to 25 percent. I hope if something like that does go through that the limit would be kept to a minimum because I would not like to see us revert back to taking men off the street and putting them in cars because of an administrative problem of not allocating enough men within a community.

To specifically answer this question - no, the Chief doesn't have flexibility because he cannot, according to their rules, put them in vehicles. He can put them where he desires. As long as the men are out there walking, the posts can readily be changed to wherever they are needed and where the manpower should be allocated. He has the right to do that. The choice of whom he would like to have on the Safe Streets Program or how long the person will stay there is another administrative problem, on which he may or may not always have the deciding vote. I know that my Chief would like to see the men stay on Safe Streets for a period of time, if they are assigned there for perhaps a year or a year and a half, or some set time, rather than have a man come in the Safe Neighborhood Program, work 4, 5, or 6 months, get accustomed to meeting people, working in the neighborhood, and then be transferred to something else.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: There is something that is bothering me in what you and Senator Graves have said. The fear we as a committee have is the police force is being supplemented by walking patrolmen through this program. If you didn't have the walking patrolmen, would your municipality replace those walking patrolmen?

CAPTAIN KELLY: I don't think it could be done. Do you, Paul?

SERGEANT HANNICK: No, definitely not.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: You say it couldn't be done?

CAPTAIN KELLY: Based on the tax situation and the cost involved, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: On the other hand, the purpose of this program was not to supplement the police force that you had in the city. It was merely for the single purpose of walking the streets, being seen, and doing the things we have been talking about. We are concerned that some towns may be using this as a vehicle to supplement their police force. And I am sure this is one of the things we will be talking about in committee.

I have no further questions.

Assemblyman Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I would just like to make one comment. I think in all the testimony we have heard throughout this meeting today and the one in Trenton last Wednesday, it is dollars, as you appropriately mentioned, that can make this walking patrolmen program go or not. This program has worked so well that I think it is incumbent upon the Legislature to continue it, in light of what we have heard to date, because, if we don't, certainly

you are going to have to cut back. You are putting 50 percent of the funds up and the State is putting up 50 percent. With 50 percent of the funds, you might be able to maintain possibly half of the walking patrolmen. But you surely couldn't maintain them all; is that correct?

CAPTAIN KELLY: Yes, sir. If I may, sir, I believe every community - I certainly can't speak for every community - but many communities are lacking police manpower. It is not up to what it should be. I would think that the majority of communities do not have as much manpower as they should have, due to budget caps and inflation. With or without these Safe Streets personnel, there would be less police than what the ordinance calls for. In my 26 1/2 years on the Police Department, I can't remember once - well, perhaps once - that we had a full complement of men.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: For instance, if this program were to be terminated at the end of this fiscal year, would you continue to do what you could in the way of walking patrolmen, or would you take those patrolmen who were left and put them in cars?

CAPTAIN KELLY: Speaking for the Chief, I believe it would be his feeling that he would take them out and put them on the regular roster of patrol.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Would they be walking patrolmen or would they be in vehicles?

CAPTAIN KELLY: I think they would be in patrol cars.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: In other words, you would do away completely with walking patrols?

CAPTAIN KELLY: It would be a necessity. Because of the administrative problems that arise in not having a full complement of men, there is always a void of five or ten men. There is never enough. So if it was not funded, these men would be taken from the walking posts and put into the regular line.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Despite the value of the program? It has worked so well. Every community has come here and said it is a great program, we have to have it, and we should have done away with the patrol cars a long time ago and have put more men on the street. Yet you are saying if this program stops tomorrow, the men that you could still afford to maintain on the force that were walking patrolmen, you would put in cars.

CAPTAIN KELLY: If there were not a sufficient number of men to fill the lines ---

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: In the walking patrol area? Is that what you are talking about?

CAPTAIN KELLY: No, in the motor patrol area. We work on a squad system, a five-squad system.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I realize that.

CAPTAIN KELLY: There should be X number of men in every squad and this is where we don't have X number of men in every squad. Now I am relating to you my Chief's feelings. If this program were not funded, he would take those men and put them back into the line.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Assemblyman Edwards.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Following up a little bit along the same line Assemblyman Smith was dealing with, we have sat here and heard witness after

witness testify that crime has been materially reduced in our cities because of walking patrolmen. I have asked the question before and you seemed to have answered it the same way, that you will maintain your full complement of automobile patrolmen that you presently have allocated to the total exclusion of walking patrolmen. What you are saying is that your automobile patrolmen in your professional opinion are more effective in crime prevention than walking patrolmen.

CAPTAIN KELLY: No, sir, not in my professional opinion.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: In your Chief's opinion.

CAPTAIN KELLY: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Suppose we put a cap on the number of police cars you have. Would that help a little?

CAPTAIN KELLY: I think most everyone in law enforcement that has not been involved closely in crime prevention has the feeling, and I did too for many years --- and I am sure if I were the Chief I would want to be able to fill up my cars and have my patrol cars all over the place to stop crime. I did believe that too, but I do not believe that now. I think that there should be an emphasis, a big emphasis, on crime prevention, because I think all the police departments react and we don't get too much "proacting." We wait until something happens and then we send a car. Why don't we use somebody beforehand because we have the data available? Why don't we do something to harden the target and prevent it rather than waiting for something to happen and then have the policeman ride down there, take a report, and say, "Ma'am, don't call me - I'll call you"? I am being very practical. Streetwise, this is what happens.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I understand. You think walking patrolmen effectively attack that problem far more significantly than a patrol car does?

CAPTAIN KELLY: Yes. I believe with the proper crime prevention program and the walking patrolmen in the residential and business neighborhoods, these two things could have a dramatic effect on the crime rate.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Thank you.

SERGEANT PAUL HANNICK: May I just say one thing. I would like to echo a lot of the comments made by the Senator. I ditto exactly what he said, with the addition that we would like to try something different. I think if we are using 100 percent foot patrol, we are left at just that. Every city is different. Every area is a little different. So we would like to try different programs. We would like to try scooters or bikes; in other words, maybe two men working as a team, one walking and one in a car or a Cushman. They back up each other. They work as a team. There are never two riding. There is always one walking and one in a vehicle. I think by doing that we can stimulate the program a little bit and also attract a lot of young men who originally come into the program; but, after a year walking the beat, they get a little bit tired of that and want to move up to the patrol cars. We don't want the program to be flooded with people who are semi-retired or those who have been on the job 25 or 30 years. We want the young men and we want to keep them in Safe Streets. We want to maintain our distinctiveness. We want to maintain the Safe Streets patrol force in Union City. All we would like is a little bit of flexibility with proper controls to develop a program - of course, with the acceptance of the State - with the proper monitoring.

We don't want to take the foot patrolmen and throw them all in police cars and just make them radio-car patrolmen, which is what we had before we had Safe Streets. We want to keep the Safe Streets patrol with a little bit of flexibility allowing for a little difference in the type of patrol.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: You alluded to the fact that the foot patrolman is tired of walking and may want to move up to a patrol car. You used the words "move up." I get the impression that the walking patrolman is at the bottom of the ladder, that he is the dreg of the department, and it is the lowest entry point or duty.

SERGEANT HANNICK: I guess that comes down from history. The men always started out walking the beat. Then if you knew somebody in City Hall, you ended up in a patrol car. Now, of course, we are not talking about that, even though a lot of them still think that way, that when you start out on foot patrol, it is the lowest point.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Emphasis before was made on crime prevention. And that kind of activity really requires a great deal more expertise than the new man walking on has. It takes some experience and it takes some training if you are going to really do a neighborhood program.

SERGEANT HANNICK: Exactly. I agree with you.

CAPTAIN KELLY: I might say that our Safe Streets men are now coming out of the Detective Bureau. We have at least four or five of our Safe Streets personnel, who have requested to come out of day work in the Detective Bureau, which was always considered "the elite" of the Police Department, to work the streets.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: We have heard that testimony before.

CAPTAIN KELLY: It has happened on numerous occasions in our town. So I don't think that Sergeant Hannick when he used that phrase meant "moving up to something." If that be the case, then there are guys that were up there that are coming down - and they want it.

SERGEANT HANNICK: There are some men who want to walk 100 percent of the time. There are others who would like a little bit of flexibility.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I want to move on here because we are running pretty late. But I hope in your anxiety for this you don't attempt to have us delete the intent of the program. The program is walking cops, walking the beats. If there is to be flexibility, so be it, but it should be determined by the Chief or by regulations established for the Chief. Thank you for coming.

We will now take a five-minute recess to give the stenographer a rest.

(Five-Minute Recess)

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: If anyone has a prepared statement and turns it over to the secretary, the entire statement will be included in the record. Maybe by doing that, we can expedite this hearing because it is getting late in the day.

Will you please call the next witness.

MR. WUNSCH: Leona Sherman, Safe and Clean Administrator of West New York. And will the other people from West New York please come up with Ms. Sherman: Chief Thomas Fitzpatrick, John Parr and Captain Raymond Williams.

T H O M A S F I T Z P A T R I C K: I am Chief Fitzpatrick of the West New York Police Department. The only contribution I have to make to the hearing is that I endorse wholeheartedly all the comments made by the previous speakers.

My only comment on the Safe Streets Program is the lack of flexibility in the Police Department. I would like to be able to permit a man who initiated a call or was on the scene at the outset of a crime to be able to pursue it a little bit further. This may require his using plain clothes. It gives a man a sense of belonging if he can continue on a case after he makes the initial contact.

I would also like to be able to use Safe Streets people to augment the tactical patrol. I don't mean in place of the tactical patrol - the composition of that is the responsibility of the Chief - but to be able to use some of the Safe Streets men to round out the tactical patrol when they are needed.

Speaking of flexibility, I must confess that invariably when I was faced with what I thought would be an emergency, after a simple phone call to the supervisors in the Safe Streets Program, they invariably endorsed my suggestion and I was permitted to employ the Safe Streets people the way I wanted to. So some flexibility can be obtained under the program by simply coordinating your thoughts with those of the people who run the program at the State level.

Another place where we run into some difficulty, at least I do, is the fact that we have no rolling stock to back up our supervisors. The Safe Streets Program will not provide any funding for motor vehicles and the only way proper supervision can be accomplished is by having the supervisors equipped with some rolling stock. We presently provide the supervisors with a vehicle. But it would be a great advantage to a department of my size to have some funding to provide a motor vehicle. The motor vehicle would be of a type that would carry equipment that could be used in various situations by the Safe Streets officers on their posts.

When it first started, my personal opinion of the Safe Streets Program was that it was a huge boondoggle. I could conceive of it being another open sewer where the money would be poured down and never be recovered. But I am firmly convinced that it is the only salvation for a city like mine, which is densely populated and the policeman on the street makes a great impression on the populous. All I get is constant praise of the great work the men are doing. So I wholeheartedly endorse the program.

I am going to turn this over to Miss Leona Sherman, who will cover the Clean portion of the program as it pertains to West New York.

L E O N A S H E R M A N: Gentlemen, as far as the Clean component of the program is concerned, for a little town such as we have in West New York, which is very heavily populated, but which is less than a mile square in area, it has been invaluable in cleaning up the streets in particular neighborhoods. We were able to purchase trucks, jeeps, litter baskets, and other things. During the snow storm of last year, with the snow plows on the jeeps, we were able to clean the streets and keep traffic flowing better.

I really can't add more than what has been said previously, other than to say the program is really tremendous. It has helped the town a lot. We would definitely like to see it continued and expanded and even increased in funds, especially where West New York is concerned.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you for your testimony. As I have said before, there is one thing that bothers me and that is the constant plea for more flexibility. We can kill the program by flexibility. I am realistic enough to know there has to be flexibility. But if we continue to talk about having flexibility so the men can ride in cars or engage in other operations just at the whim of someone who says it is an emergency, we could lose the whole program. I caution all of you, while we will be making recommendations, I hope we don't go too far in the direction of flexibility. I believe there should be some.

MR. FITZPATRICK: May I answer that, please. I am a firm believer in sticking close to the guidelines laid down by the Supervisor of Safe Streets. I will not under any circumstance turn over any Safe Streets' equipment for use by the West New York Police Department. I feel that West New York has an obligation of its own to buy cars, radios and all the equipment that is mandated by law that should be bought by West New York. I believe the Safe Streets Program just augments the regular force and should not be in place of it. I defy anyone, even the Mayor, to take a radio that belongs to Safe Streets under any circumstance unless I get it in writing.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: I have one question. Mrs. Sherman, you are the administrator of Safe and Clean?

MS. SHERMAN: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: And you have an Assistant Administrator of Safe and Clean?

MS. SHERMAN: I beg your pardon.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: There is a John Parr who is listed here as Assistant Administrator.

MS. SHERMAN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: From an administrative standpoint, is it necessary to have that much administrative supervision?

MS. SHERMAN: He works only on a part-time basis. He is not a full-time Assistant. He works from 9:00 to 12:00.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Are you both paid by the Safe and Clean Streets Program?

MS. SHERMAN: No, just his salary is paid.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS: Just his is?

MS. SHERMAN: No portion of mine is.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: This is just a comment. I don't know whether it is the intent of the legislation or not, but it seems to me that the Safe Program should be an integral part of your overall police protection in your municipality. So if you have a foot patrolman on the Clean and Safe Streets Program who calls in, he does in actuality have a backup from your regular force. Am I missing the point here?

MR. FITZPATRICK: You are missing the point. I am just saying that the Safe Streets Program should not buy equipment for the Town of West New York.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I agree with that.

MR. FITZPATRICK: In the beginning, there seemed to be a cleavage between the regular officers or those paid by West New York and those paid by Safe Streets.

I tried to break that feeling down immediately by telling them the only difference between them was who was paying their salaries.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: They should be an integral part of the Police Department.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Exactly right.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

MR. WUNSCH: Next we will hear from the contingent from East Orange: Conrad Gaskin, Captain Thomas Granahan, William Reimer and Edward Mandell.

C O N R A D G A S K I N: There is one correction to the names as listed. Would you delete the name of Mr. William Reimer, Assistant City Engineer, and replace it with the name of Mr. Otto Broz, also Assistant City Engineer.

We each have brief statements to read. We will be available for questioning thereafter. We will begin with Captain Granahan, the Safe Neighborhoods Unit Commander.

T H O M A S G R A N A H A N: Good afternoon. I am the Safe Neighborhoods Unit Commander. The unit consists of 61 officers. It is one of the larger ones in the State. I have 3 Sergeants, 2 Lieutenants and myself. We are providing a vital part of the police service delivered by the East Orange Police Department.

During 1977, we compiled some impressive statistics. We issued 43,000 summonses. There were 490 on-scene arrests. We initiated 735 offense reports and answered 1,043 calls for service for check-outs, escorts and the like. We dispatched 8,094 calls.

These statistics, themselves, would be enough to justify the existence of a unit such as ours. But I don't think they show the real value of the Safe Neighborhoods program, which has to do with the dramatic reduction of the fear that stalked our streets before the Safe Neighborhoods Program. We have been able to replace that fear with a sense of security.

One of my posts doesn't stay vacant very long because of sickness, vacation or the like, before I start getting calls to my office inquiring why the post is open. There is a very positive feeling in the community because of this and we think we have been able to turn the atmosphere of the city around quite a bit in the five years that it has been in existence.

One of the problems that is developing with the program is the stagnated funding at a time when costs keep escalating. The cost of maintaining a man on the street keeps on rising.

In January of 1978, a negotiated change in the department work schedule reduced the workweek from 40 hours to 37 hours and 20 minutes. This, of course, necessitated more relief men to keep our posts manned.

In 1973, when this program began, we were able to hire entry level officers at \$13,703. We now have a mature program and, as of February 1979, our cost will be \$16,920 plus benefits per man. I might add that this salary is an arbitrator's award, those granted by the city.

There has to be an increase to the amount of funds available for the program or we will begin to lose our effectiveness.

As was alluded to before in the testimony, there is no substitute for the Safe Neighborhoods Program if we are to maintain walking patrolmen on the

streets. The costs are too high for our municipality to bear and the pressures of services called for are too great not to have the temptation to put the people in cars. Earlier one of the members of the committee asked: If it is a good program, why would we take men off the streets? We have a concomitant problem at the same time of services called for, committing all our cars at one time. The pressure for this type of service becomes tremendous and the temptation would be too much, without a mandate to keep men on the street, to assign them to cars.

In summary, we have a good, vital, necessary program, but we need additional funding to maintain it.

O T T O B R O Z: I am Otto Broz, Assistant City Engineer, Engineering Department.

When the program began some five years ago, we were told that it could not be a substitute for existing city services. We had to give a service that had not been given previously. As far as the Engineering Department was concerned, this fell into a couple of categories.

We developed a plan which prior to 1973 we had not carried out in certain sections of the city which we had considered minor residential streets. We also said that we would like the opportunity to be able to repave more streets than we had the capability of doing under city finances. What we had planned was six people in a crew - three truck drivers, a laborer, a heavy equipment operator, and a foreman. We had asked the first couple of years for their salary and to purchase equipment so that these men could help pave more streets through the spring and summer months and, in the winter, help salt streets that had never received that service. What we were able to do with the program, which we called the salting and thin overlay program, was pay approximately \$50,000 a year in salaries for these men - they were a supplement to our work group - and we also received \$10,000 in the first year and \$20,000 in each succeeding year for salt. Last winter, with the weather we had, you can realize how important this was in keeping the streets safe. This was something that would never have been supplied, if it were not for the Safe and Clean Program. These six men work the entire 12 months, doing the paving when they can and salting during the storms.

With regard to other programs, asphalt in our first year cost \$20,000 and the second year was \$30,000, because we were in the midst of purchasing a dump truck and the asphalt machinery. The third year, we were up to \$40,000; in the fourth year, \$50,000; and the fifth year, \$80,000. Now we have supplemented it with CDA funds. But we are at a point where we have the men and we have the equipment and, if there were any cutbacks in the Safe and Clean Program, it would hurt. At this time we can put down approximately \$150 to \$250 thousand worth of asphalt a year - that is in-house with no contracts. It is done with our own personnel. To reduce the Clean portion, as far as our asphalt program is concerned, would create a problem for our department.

The other major item was in street lighting. This has been grouped in the Clean portion. I always believed it should have been in the Safe portion. But I really don't care as long as we have the funding. We have been talking about walking patrols and I really feel that adequate street lighting is a

necessity.

We have had a program for five years. We have supplemented the Safe and Clean Streets money of \$612,000 with \$60,000 of Community Development Act funds and \$115,000 of municipal funds. We have converted approximately 732 gas lamps to mercury vapor lighting. As of January 1st of 1979, we hope to have only 50 lamps remaining, for which we would hope to have additional funding of \$65,000 to \$70,000 to complete the program.

One final item, our Engineering Department is basically a Department of Public Works. I think it is wrong to think of Safe and Clean Streets as applying just to the Police Department because there are an awful lot of supportive services that Public Works people supply. About a year and a half or two years ago, we had members of the Department of Community Affairs in East Orange and they agreed that they would help us seek funding through Safe and Clean for an addition to our central city garage. We had expanded that and we were servicing municipal equipment there. We had asked for \$80,000 in Safe and Clean funds, which we received, and we backed it up with a bond ordinance of \$80,000, for a total of \$160,000. This past Monday, we finally got the bids in and the low bid was \$230,000. This means that we either have to seek additional funding or try to come up with a bond ordinance for the city.

I bring this out because programs that have been working are now going to suffer from rising construction costs, as far as capital improvements go, and increases in salaries over this five-year period. Even a \$10,000 cut in money for salaries would break that six-man crew down. We would thereby lose some time in the use of the equipment. That program is a complete program that has to be considered as a neighborhood-type situation because if the overlay moneys would not be forthcoming from Safe and Clean and the city desired to keep this program going, funds would have to come from other areas. In like manner, if the program affected our Police Department, we would have to have certain cutbacks in the public works and engineering aspects. Thank you.

EDWARD MANDELL: My name is Ed Mandell and I am the Director of Housing Services Administration in the City of East Orange.

The Housing Services Administration is under the Planning Department of the City of East Orange and is responsible for implementing a portion of the Clean aspect of the Safe and Clean Act. We have heard a lot here today about the Safe portion and I want to talk a little bit about the Clean portion.

East Orange's program is a two-fold program, in that it consists of the self-help program and also the small tool-lending libraries. Both of these programs act in concert with one another, and are also complementary to each other. The self-help program allocates up to \$300 worth of exterior building materials, such as wood, paint, gutters, leaders, etc., to any residential homeowner in the city. The purpose is to prevent further decay and to correct violations of the city's property maintenance code.

Because material costs for lumber and other building materials have increased substantially over the last few years, we have had to increase the allotment to the homeowners of \$250 annually to \$300, effective July 1st of 1978. This self-help rehabilitation program serves about 800 applicants per year, including amendments to the original application. The program is well

received by our citizens. Our biggest problem is distribution and receipt of materials because of the uncertainty of obtaining a labor force from such programs as CETA or PACE or some of these welfare programs which we have heard about.

Our Tool Lending Libraries, of which there are two in number, provide a major factor in assisting the resident homeowners to apply the Self Help materials which are received from the Self Help Program in the correction of code violations. Any homeowner can borrow a wide variety of tools from these libraries including, but not limited to, such items as power saws, shovels, rakes, ladders and a large assortment of other items for doing home repairs.

We have between 100 and 110 requests per week for tools. We project 3,000 requests by the end of this current year.

The success of our program is borne out by the fact that we have had numerous inquiries from municipalities throughout the State, including Atlantic City, Bridgeton, Jersey City, Paterson, Irvington and many more. In fact, this morning, I had a call from Little Ferry. We also received one today from Plainfield. We have been written up in the New York Times, the New York Sunday News and many more local newspapers. We have also appeared on Channel 9 and Channel 5.

We sincerely hope that this committee will see the great merit of these programs and recommend additional and increased funding to the Safe and Clean Program for the coming year. Thank you.

C O N R A D G A S K I N: Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the Assembly Municipal Government Committee, my name is Conrad Gaskin. I am the Municipal Administrator for the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program, City of East Orange, and Assistant Director of the Department of Planning and Grants Administration.

We have heard testimony from Captain Thomas Granahan, Commander of the Safe Neighborhoods Unit of the East Orange Police Department; Assistant City Engineer Otto Broz; and Edward Mandell, member of our Department of Planning and Grants Administration, Division of Housing Services, and Director of our Self-Help Housing Rehabilitation Program, which clearly illustrated the facts, figures, problem areas, successes, and failures of the East Orange Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program.

Within the context of the foregoing, I shall attempt to share with you some of the overall administrative, management, budgeting, and programming aspects of our Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program.

Administratively, we find the Safe Neighborhoods Unit is undermanned on both the Superior Officer and Walking Patrolman levels. To overcome this dilemma, presents a management problem with respect to labor relations. Yet the Safe component is currently consuming 80 percent of the entire Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program grant to the City of East Orange, which is the maximum allowed under current guidelines. In light of the current grant amount allotted to East Orange, if the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program is continued in fiscal year 1980 at the same funding level as at present, the City of East Orange in its programming will have to either provide the essential services which would, unfortunately, increase the tax base, or we will have to sacrifice very necessary services which would lead to neighborhood deterioration and social unrest. This rippling effect may be seen in our Engineering Department as well, where adequate equipment has been purchased over the years, but any further

reduction in manpower, due to insufficient budgeting, would lead to inadequate programming of activities, for which the grant was intended.

Similarly, in our Self-Help Housing Rehabilitation Program, the need to rely upon CETA persons to augment the regular staff is being viewed as an in-place arrangement, as opposed to a temporary stop-gap measure, only because the budget as it currently stands does not allow for additional staffing outside of these arrangements. Furthermore, we know that the CETA program is seriously threatened with cutbacks or withdrawals which will negatively impact the planning process at the project scale.

The resulting force which this will exert will also be felt by other municipally and federally funded programs which were intended for neighborhood uplift and improvement, or otherwise dovetailed into other physical and social programs supported by the State of New Jersey as well. It is this that we do not wish to experience.

Overall, there are those items which are above and beyond the scope of what was discussed heretofore, and which need to be brought to your attention.

In East Orange, we have discovered that there have been several needed projects and items which, to our way of thinking, fit clearly, or should fit clearly within the definition of Safe and/or Clean, but because of guideline restrictions, the city has had to suffer without these projects and items. To echo Commander Granahan's concerns, our specific example within the context of the foregoing statement, is that patrolmen must be transported to their posts. Knowing well that an auto can transport only four patrolmen, or at the most two to three prisoners, we believe that the Safe Neighborhoods Unit would be much more efficient on the management end if the aforementioned guidelines would allow for the purchase of a van to transport additional walking personnel to their posts. Another case in point is that the guidelines allow for the purchase of salt for the removal of hazardous icy conditions on our heavily travelled municipal arterials; yet, a dichotomy is present inasmuch as we are not allowed to protect the investment for salt through the purchase of construction of a storage facility to minimize waste.

In conclusion, the City of East Orange in witness of the testimony presented herewith, will support stronger policies and legislation which will result in additional appropriations that can be allocated to preserving and strengthening the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program as a functional method of providing safe and cleaner neighborhoods for our residents et al.

Thank you very much for your attention.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCIA: Thank you. I want to compliment the City of East Orange for sending four men to represent the city. I would appreciate very much if I could receive from this gentleman here the details of the innovative program that you have. I think it would be wise if we had that as part of our agenda when we start working on our recommendations. If that is possible, I would appreciate getting it as quickly as I can.

I have no questions. Are there any questions from the committee? (No questions)

MR. WUNSCH: Next are the representatives from Newark: Deputy Chief Thomas Henry and Wallace White.

THOMAS HENRY: I am Deputy Chief Thomas Henry. I don't have a prepared statement. I don't have many remarks to make. I did feel since

I have been involved in the Safe side of the program in Newark since its inception that I might be able to provide some information to you gentlemen.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I know that you have sat here very patiently throughout the afternoon and have heard most of the testimony that has been given. If there is anything you think we haven't heard, I would appreciate your telling us about it.

MR. HENRY: From a selfish police standpoint, I would prefer to see more concern given to the Safe side of the program than the Clean side. Personally, I think it would be better for the community to feel safe in an unclean area than it would be to feel unsafe in a clean area. But, again, that is probably a selfish police attitude.

As far as the flexibility that I have heard discussed earlier is concerned, in my involvement with the program, I have sufficient flexibility to meet the needs within my operation. I am afraid if too much flexibility were granted, it would create a problem not only within a department to administer the program, but for the program itself. One of the things that allows me to resist the efforts by people above me to use the Safe Streets personnel contrary to the terms of the contract is the contract, itself. I feel certain if they didn't have the restrictions set forth in the contract, that eventually the men would ride in the radio cars performing all four services, over and above what should be done normally.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: You then agree with me that the possibilities are that we would delete from the program if we gave too much permissiveness.

MR. HENRY: Definitely. There is no question about that. I have to resist that problem almost each and every day.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: I have just one question, Chief. It has been said that with the walking patrolmen in the Safe part of the program, crime has reduced markedly in most of the municipalities. Do you feel that is solely due to the walking patrol program or are there other factors that may be involved that contribute to the decrease in crime? Do you find that to be the case in areas where you don't have a walking patrolman?

MR. HENRY: I think over the last several years, at least in Newark, the crime rate has been going down rather steadily. More important than the crime rate, itself, I feel that the visibility of the walking patrolmen in this program creates an atmosphere where the people are willing once again to walk the streets with some assurance as to their safety. As an example, it is my personal feeling that the utilization of the Safe Streets personnel in the downtown area has at least stabilized criminal conditions in that area. Rather than the remaining merchants being chased out of downtown because of the crime, I think they are beginning to stay. I see signs of merchants starting to come back or, at least, new merchants are coming in.

The last several years, through the utilization of Safe Streets personnel, the shopping area in downtown Newark, I think has realized a 16 or 17 percent increase in sales. I feel that this has happened because the people have some assurance that there is additional police personnel working down there.

I don't feel that the crime rate, itself, is the total indicator. There are factors that we can't measure, such as the person who either rides

through Newark or lives in Newark and has that feeling that it is a safer place to be - he may come in or may stay in Newark to do some shopping or conduct other business - as well as the persons in the community who now feel they can get out of their houses at hours they couldn't before.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate your coming here and waiting so long. Please call the next witness.

MR. WUNSCH: Next is the contingent from Bloomfield: Mayor John Kinder, Police Chief Anthony Castago, and Mr. H. Joseph North, the Town Administrator.

J O H N K I N D E R: I am Mayor Kinder from Bloomfield. I will be the only spokesman unless there are questions that you wish to ask the Chief of the Police Department, or the Town Administrator, or our Financial Director.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity afforded to us to state our case and listen to the other communities, particularly those that surround the Town of Bloomfield, tell of their successes with the Clean and Safe Streets Program. We are not here to tell you what we are doing in that regard. We are here to seek funds because we have qualified for such funds.

The success of this program has affected our community in many respects. It is my understanding that Councilman Gallo was here earlier and indicated that we are starting to experience an increase in crime. We feel that the Safe Streets moneys that are allocated to our good neighbors have pushed, in a way, those unwanted citizens into our community.

I have a brief statement. I am not going to take too long.

The Town of Bloomfield is now qualified to receive State funds under the Safe and Clean Neighborhood Act. However, our community is not receiving this aid although 28 municipalities are being funded. This is unfair and discriminatory.

On behalf of the people of Bloomfield, I strongly urge the Committee to do whatever is necessary to see that our town is funded in this program in this fiscal year.

Two years ago, four communities - North Bergen, Phillipsburg, West New York and Montclair - were newly qualified and funded. The Town of Bloomfield requests only equal treatment in 1978. Of the 28 communities now being funded, Bloomfield has a greater population than 17 of them. In a comparison of density, Bloomfield is more densely populated than 13 of the funded communities.

Bloomfield is an older suburb. Our town is completely developed with little room for expansion of ratables. The municipality is fighting aggressively to keep Bloomfield safe and clean with the most imaginative use of a small amount of aid the State makes available. The State has put conservatively run towns like Bloomfield in a vise first with a 5 percent CAP on our expenditures and, secondly, with binding arbitration with police and fire unions. Our town has a paid fire department with an authorized strength of 116 men, as well as the police department with 120 men. The State has also surrounded Bloomfield in Essex County with communities that are funded and which communities put their funds into strengthening their police services. Our police department statistics show dramatically the movement of crime problems from adjacent and nearby funded communities to Bloomfield. This has put extraordinary pressure on our property taxpayers to increase police services.

Bloomfield needs State help now under the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods program so that we can provide these necessary increased police services, especially in the area of walking policemen. This town would make good use of the money as well to clean the more congested areas of our town, especially the central business district. Our central business district, satellite business districts and our neighborhoods can be made safer and cleaner if the Legislature and the Governor put their efforts into funding our community.

Gentlemen, we are only asking for simple justice.

I would like to submit as well lists we have had made comparing the density of population of the Town of Bloomfield, which has been qualified but not funded by the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program, with the 28 municipalities qualified and funded. I think this is documentation that will support our pleas for some funds in this area. (See pages 1X and 2X.)

In addition, there is one question I would like to ask the Committee. If someone can give me the answer, I would appreciate it. Does anyone on the Committee know what legal basis there is for not funding Bloomfield?

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: The only legal basis I know is that the money just isn't there. However, your plight is one that every member of the Committee is aware of and is in sympathy with. You people are entitled to the money under the formula that is in existence for municipalities. Unfortunately, nothing has been done. This Committee will certainly look into the matter and try to help as soon as possible and not wait for the expiration of the program this year. I don't know what we can do and I don't want to leave you with the impression that we can wave a wand and be able to supply the money that is necessary. The question arises whether or not the money should be redistributed among all of the 31 municipalities that are now involved or whether we should continue this year with the present distribution. I am under the impression that it was decided to do the latter, but in the future it would be mandated that you would receive your share. Of course, your problem is an immediate one. I don't know that I have any answer. All I can tell you is that this Committee will make an effort to see what we can do.

MAYOR KINDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If there are any questions you wish to ask, I or any of the people here with me will be glad to answer. For the record, I would like to point out that Mr. North, the Town Administrator; Chief Castago of our Police Department; and Mr. Auriemma, our Finance Director, are here.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: May I make a suggestion?

MAYOR KINDER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: This is a legal question that you pose.

MAYOR KINDER: Yes, it is.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I suggest that perhaps you ask for an interpretation from the Attorney General's Office as to exactly where your town stands.

MR. WUNSCH: I think I can speak to the legal question. The Safe and Clean Program is a temporary program and it is re-enacted every year. This year, this Committee, the Municipal Government Committee, moved Senate Bill 1185, which was enacted into law. I believe the Governor signed it in either June or July of this year. What the law said in essence was that the Safe and Clean

Program shall be established as it was pursuant to the Urban Aid formula, but only those municipalities which received Safe and Clean money in the last fiscal year shall receive it this fiscal year. In so doing, you people were excluded.

Now the Committee, I believe, was well aware and informed that you were being excluded. But, at the time, if it had delayed moving the bill, then even the twenty-eight municipalities would have been denied urgent funding. So it felt that discretion would be the better part of valor, that it would move the bill, that it would see that that bill was enacted into law, and then it would see what it could do for you. One of the results of that is this series of hearings. If it had delayed in moving the bill, then the whole program would have had to cease for some period of weeks, at least. So, very clearly, there is legal justification for excluding these municipalities.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: I recall vividly that we had to call an emergency meeting of the Committee in order to take action on the bill, so we wouldn't hold up the funding of the rest of the program. However, I feel that this matter should be looked into and I intend to have this Committee do that.

MAYOR KINDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: Thank you.

MAYOR KINDER: Is that all the questions you have?

ASSEMBLYMAN PELLECCCHIA: That is all.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard? If not, this hearing is concluded.

(Hearing concluded)

- - - - -

COMPARISON AS TO DENSITY OF POPULATION OF THE TOWN OF BLOOMFIELD
QUALIFIED BUT NOT FUNDED IN THE SAFE AND CLEAN NEIGHBORHOODS
PROGRAM WITH TWENTY EIGHT MUNICIPALITIES QUALIFIED AND FUNDED

DENSITY RANK	MUNICIPALITY	1976 ESTIMATE POPULATION	AREA	DENSITY
29	Millville	22,910	43.00	532.79
28	Vineland	51,140	69.50	735.83
27	Lakewood	32,945	24.40	1,350.20
26	Bridgeton	21,465	6.50	3,302.31
25	Atlantic City	40,780	11.84	3,444.26
24	Neptune	28,420	8.00	3,552.50
23	Philipsburg	17,770	2.90	6,127.59
22	Long Branch	33,515	5.10	6,571.57
21	Montclair	43,395	6.20	6,999.19
20	New Brunswick	42,790	5.50	7,780.00
19	Plainfield	48,075	6.00	8,012.50
18	Perth Amboy	39,760	4.55	8,738.46
17	North Bergen	48,175	5.40	8,921.30
16	<u>BLOOMFIELD</u>	52,185	5.40	9,663.89
15	Elizabeth	114,685	11.69	9,810.52
14	Ashbury Park	16,410	1.50	10,940.00
13	Camden	100,535	8.68	11,582.37
12	Bayonne	73,445	5.39	13,626.16
11	Trenton	106,825	7.50	14,243.33
10	Orange	33,300	2.20	15,136.36
9	Newark	373,025	24.14	15,452.57
8	Passaic	55,955	3.20	17,485.94
7	Jersey City	256,235	14.65	17,490.44
6	Paterson	152,568	8.44	18,076.78
5	East Orange	76,395	4.00	19,098.75
4	Irvington	58,420	2.80	20,864.29
3	Hoboken	46,290	1.30	35,607.69
2	Union City	57,560	1.40	41,114.29
1	West New York	41,140	.90	45,711.11

COMPARISON AS TO POPULATION OF THE TOWN OF BLOOMFIELD
 QUALIFIED BUT NOT FUNDED IN THE SAFE AND CLEAN NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM
 WITH THE TWENTY EIGHT (28) MUNICIPALITIES QUALIFIED AND FUNDED

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1976 ESTIMATES POPULATION</u>	<u>POPULATION RANK</u>
Newark	373,025	1
Jersey City	256,235	2
Paterson	152,568	3
Elizabeth	114,685	4
Trenton	106,825	5
Camden	100,535	6
East Orange	76,395	7
Bayonne	73,445	8
Irvington	58,420	9
Union City	57,560	10
Passaic	55,955	11
<u>BLOOMFIELD</u>	<u>52,185</u>	<u>12</u>
Vineland	51,140	13
North Bergen	48,175	14
Plainfield	48,075	15
Hoboken	46,290	16
Montclair	43,395	17
New Brunswick	42,790	18
West New York	41,140	19
Atlantic City	40,780	20
Perth Amboy	39,760	21
Long Branch	33,515	22
Orange	33,300	23
Lakewood	32,945	24
Neptune	28,420	25
Millville	22,910	26
Bridgeton	21,465	27
Philipsburg	17,770	28
Ashbury Park	16,410	29



CITY OF PASSAIC
NEW JERSEY
101 PASSAIC AVENUE
PASSAIC, NEW JERSEY
07055

September 27, 1978

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE NEW JERSEY
COUNTY ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY
KENNETH R. MAHONY, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR/
POLICE DIRECTOR -- 101 Passaic Avenue
Passaic, New Jersey
HONORABLE VINCENT PELLECCCHIA, PRESIDING

Gentlemen:

Thank you for this opportunity to present my views relative to the past impact of the Safe Street Clean Neighborhood Program upon the City of Passaic, New Jersey. I will further discuss what I see as the future possibility of the program.

Since 1973 the City of Passaic has received a sum of money equal to approximately \$403,000.00, Fifth Year 77/78. These funds have been matched on an equal basis from various City sources currently our Community Development Block Grant. Currently, this provides the City with 32 walking policemen on the Safe side and 15 men in the Public Works Department who work on the Clean side.

I believe that this program is in large partly responsible for the improved appearance i.e. cleanliness and safety of the Downtown Passaic area.

Originally about one half of the project was devoted to projects rather than personnel. This included plantings, rest areas, trash receptacles, sidewalk improvements, etc. As inflation has eaten into the original grant, a greater proportion of the money has had to be preserved for salaries to maintain the safety, to maintain the appearance of these areas originally improved by the grant.

Historically I believe the program has been a success. That it has helped us offset the disadvantages of age, inconvenience and crime of our relatively congested business areas.

The Safe Streets Clean Neighborhood Program has over the past few years helped fill a gap in aid resources for what amount to soft Public Works money and for walking policemen. It would be easy to say that we need more with less controls and in fact I do feel that more funds could be advantageously used by not only the city of Passaic but other cities in similar situations.

In our fiscal '79 we will for the first time be actually picking up more than one half of the program due to the inflationary effect of the salaries contained in the program.

I would like to see the program restored to its 1973 dollar value in terms of the grant. This would mean probably at least a 50% increase in the State contribution. I would like to see some funds set aside for innovated programs aimed at maximizing the effect of walking patrolmen. On the Clean side additional funds with the existing regulations could be advantageously used by all urban communities.

In conclusion, I would like to commend not only Barry Skokowski, Director of the Program but his Assistant Elmer Collins, Donald Hubschman, Michael Renahan and Peter LaConti for their invaluable assistance and advice with the program.



CITY OF ATLANTIC CITY
NEW JERSEY 08401
PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

SEP 25 1978

September 22, 1978

Mr. Vincent O. Pellecchia
Chairman
Assembly Municipal Government Committee
Room 218
State House
Trenton, N.J. 08625

Dear Mr. Pellecchia

I must apologize that neither Mr. Micale nor myself will be able to attend your public hearings due to previous commitments. But we do feel that the content of the hearings is very important to the City of Atlantic City. Consequently, I offer the following written testimony which I hope you will forward to the Committee.

The safe component has produced a visual and positive impact on the neighborhoods. The patrolmen have become familiar with the neighborhoods and its residents. This relationship enable neighborhood residents to feel safer and criminal elements are fully aware of their existenance which has deterred crime.

The clean component has helped to stabilize our neighborhoods and produce a better environment and standard of living for its residents. Over the years approximately one thousand (1000) hazardous buildings have been demolished, street lighting has been improved, streets paved, mini parks constructed, trees planted, etc. This has enabled the residents to take pride in his neighborhood and may have saved his life and property (in regards to the removal of fire hazards).

The Police Chief has no problem with control of the police part of the program. He does desire more flexibility, particularly now that we are experiencing casino impact. At times, allocation of manpower reached a priority stage and flexibility to walking police officers often is viewed as an immediate solution to particular problems.

The program is coordinated with other State or Federal grants. We try to accomplish in each neighborhood the objectives of each grant. We also do things which compliment each grant. For example, Safe and Clean has been demolishing hazardous buildings while Community Development Funds have provided money to rehabilitate existing properties. These go hand in hand since we can't expect a homeowner to rehabilitate his property if he is living next door to a fire hazard.


The program is even more valuable now since it is outside the State mandated 5% CAP. If this program were terminated, its objectives would fall directly on the City's budget which would be impossible to accomplish. We would hope in the future, that the total grant be increased since the total grant has remained the same (\$1,218,582) for five (5) years. Salary and wage increases for the patrolmen are beginning to outstrip the clean component. When the grant was first implemented fifty percent was allocated to each component. At the present time, approximately eighty percent is safe and twenty percent clean.

The Chief of Police also has expressed his desire to see the police part of the program expanded. Once, again, due to casino growth, our re-organization of patrol mandates additional foot patrols in our patrol districts, particularly the boardwalk district, which will be created in the immediate future. As a result, Chief Ten Brink, has expressed his desire to increase his unit by twenty-five (25) patrol officers and one (1) police sergeant.

It goes without saying, that this is one of the best grant programs in the state.

If additional information is needed, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,


Edwin J. Roth
Commissioner

EJR/mb



CITY OF ELIZABETH, NEW JERSEY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR

THOMAS G. DUNN
MAYOR

September 25, 1978

Mr. James Wunsch, Committee Aide
State of New Jersey
Assembly Municipal Government Committee
Room 218, State House
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Dear Mr. Wunsch:

Enclosed find written testimony to The Municipal Government Committee of the New Jersey General Assembly regarding the Safe & Clean Neighborhood Program.

Being involved in the Clean portion of this program I am submitting the following comments for your consideration.

Since its inception and being a major part of it for the City, I have found it to be an outstanding program of great benefit to the City both, financially and for a clean City.

With the additional personnel, we were able to serve our citizens with more "attention" to maintain a clean City. With the equipment we were able purchase with the Safe and Clean funds, we were able to accomplish our programs in the City.

Our street resurfacing program by City Forces has been a tremendous success with funds for equipment and asphalt. Also, we were able to purchase street sweepers, water wagon, roller, pick-up trucks, and other vehicles to perform our work which was a tribute to the Safe and Clean Program.

Being a former councilman, I realize it more than the average citizen that the financial help given to the City by the State through this program results in a tax savings and helping to keep Elizabeth a good and clean place to live in.

I sincerely hope that the committee sees fit in their judgment to continue this program so that we can continue to maintain our City and relieve the taxpayer of some of the financial burden to live a respectful life.

This program is "MONIES" well spent of which the State Officials should be proud and continue it for the good of all concerned.

Yours truly,

7X

Frank A. Cyron
Frank A. Cyron, Director of Public Works

FAC/rc

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED TO:
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
ASSEMBLY MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

SAFE AND CLEAN NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM
CITY OF PERTH AMBOY NEW JERSEY
GEORGE J. OTLOWSKI, MAYOR

BY:
PAULINE PARKIN, PRINCIPAL PLANNER
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
133 NEW BRUNSWICK AVENUE
PERTH AMBOY, NEW JERSEY

The City of Perth Amboy has participated in the Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program since its inception in Fiscal Year 1974.

The City is an older urban area which relied on its industrial tax base to support local services. Since the early 1970's this tax base has been reduced by industries leaving the City. At the same time costs of maintaining services increased. Property taxes were increasing yet it seemed that services to residents were decreasing and public property was deteriorating because of lack of funds to finance improvements and services.

The Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program seemed to come along at just the right time. It enabled the City to hire Walking Patrolmen, upgrade municipal properties and increase services at half the cost to the municipal homeowner.

Sixteen Walking Patrolmen were placed on six posts during the first year. The re-institution of the Walking Patrolmen provided benefits in neighborhoods almost immediately. The Chief of Police has cited the following benefits of the Safe Neighborhood Program.

- 1- Allowed for more Police Officers for street patrol
- 2- Awareness of the Police Officer by residents within the Safe Streets neighborhood
- 3- Immediate availability of the Police Officer by the residents within the Safe Neighborhoods
- 4- A secure feeling by the residents, knowing that a Police Officer is in their neighborhood at all times
- 5- The Police Officer assigned becomes familiar with the neighborhood and the residents in the neighborhood
- 6- The presence of the Walking Patrolmen has reduced crimes against persons in the Safe Neighborhoods

Problems as seen by the Chief of Police include:

- 1- The Police Officer assigned considers the walking post lacking in excitement

- 2- The Police Officers prefer to alternate posts that are under the Safe Streets Program
- 3- The Police Officer prefers assignment to Radio Car Patrol

A larger impact on the neighborhoods was seen as parks were renovated, relandscaped with safety in mind and lighting and fencing installed.

The Safe Neighborhoods Program in the City has remained relatively stable over the last couple of years, but the cost of maintaining the program has increased. Patrolmen salaries have risen from \$10,355 each annually in FY '74 to \$16,276 each. Fringe Benefits have increased from 12% of base salaries in FY '74 to 27% in FY '77. This does not include training, clothing, personal equipment or overtime expenses. If all the expenses of maintaining the Safe Neighborhoods Program were charged to the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program Budget the Safe Component Budget would account for more than 76% of the total program costs during FY '78-79. Present guidelines state that a minimum of 50% of the total Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program Budget must be expended for the Safe Neighborhoods Program, however, the DCA Division of Local Government Services, responsible for the administration of the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program has indicated that no more than 75% of the Program should be expended for the Safe Component while also asking the municipality to expend at least 30% of its Clean Neighborhoods Component for capital projects. If followed, these directives would mean a cut back in personnel at a time when unemployment in the City is still high and the municipal budget very tight. A review of the City's Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program basic grant expenditures over the past five years shows that almost 80% of the Clean Neighborhoods expenditures have been for capital projects. Eleven parks have been redeveloped, beaches have been reclaimed, two major deteriorated structures have been demolished and the area landscaped for a park. Eleven basketball courts have been refurbished or constructed, four handball courts have been constructed and twelve streets have been resurfaced.

Realizing the need to maintain these improvements, equipment was purchased and in FY '76-77 for the first time since the inception of the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program, personnel were hired through the Clean Neighborhoods Program to provide accelerated services in the Clean Neighborhoods, such as additional street cleaning and rubbish pick up. Field representatives are in constant communication with neighborhood residents and inform the proper departments of any trouble spots in the neighborhood while at the same time organizing clean-up campaigns and engaging neighborhood residents to voluntarily clean-up and fix-up and most important eliminate code violations.

It should be noted that the unemployment rate in the City was at a high 13.5% during the later part of 1975 and beginning of 1976 and every effort was being made by the administration to employ residents and attempt to prevent a further decline of the City's economy.

The outlook for the future is encouraging with at least three major industrial tracts being redeveloped. The economic impact of this industrial redevelopment is at least five years away. In the meantime the City must rely on State and Federal resources.

The impact of the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program cannot be discussed on a year by year basis but the planned impact over the last five years. The consistency with which the program has been funded has enabled the Walking Patrolmen to become an integral part of the City's Uniformed Police Force. An abrupt ending to the Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program would leave a gap in the police force of 16 patrolmen, that the City could not afford at this time. The loss of 16 patrolmen would in effect be a step backwards for the City.

Without patrolmen to safeguard property and prevent vandalism and Clean Neighborhood Personnel to maintain and continue redevelopment in the neighborhoods, the redevelopment of public and private

properties through all sources would be fruitless, as normal use would see properties deteriorating once again.

The flexibility with which the City has been able to implement the Clean Neighborhoods Component of the Safe and Clean Neighborhood Program to meet local priorities in coordination with other programs such as Community Development, Neighborhood Preservation, Public Works Projects and CETA has produced maximum benefits.

The Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Program has become an integral part of the City and it is hoped it will remain so. Changes, at the minimum, should reflect the increased cost of services, especially in Patrolmen salaries, experienced over the past few years. Larger appropriations would be necessary if the concept of the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods is to remain.

The present levels of funding have forced a reduction in the Clean Neighborhoods Component, funds just aren't available in the program for the increased services necessary to maintain the Clean Neighborhoods, and initiate capital projects. Reductions in the Safe Neighborhoods Program would mean the elimination of Safe Neighborhoods Posts. The program works because the two components are integrated, reduction and/or elimination of either component would produce an entirely different concept.

BRODART, INC	Cat. No. 23-221

BRODART, INC.

Cat. No. 23-221

