

AN EMPIRICALLY-BASED STRATEGIC PLAN TO PREVENT CRIME IN JERSEY CITY'S LAFAYETTE/MORRIS CANAL NEIGHBORHOOD

FINAL REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISOR TO THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

September 2003

By

ANNE T. SULTON, Ph.D., J.D.



NOTE

The work noted herein was supported by a grant, in 2001, from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) - Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program (COPC) to New Jersey City University (NJCU). The views expressed herein are those of the author, Anne T. Sulton, Ph.D., J.D., and do not necessarily represent or reflect the opinions, points of view, or policies of HUD, COPC, or NJCU.

Duplicating and distribution of this report, in whole or in part, are encouraged. Prior permission is not necessary. Proper citation is required.

Paper copies of this Report were printed and distributed to Lafayette/Morris Canal neighborhood residents, businesses owners in the neighborhood, and police officers. This Internet version of the Report differs slightly from the paper version of the Report - it does not contain all the charts and graphs summarizing the data, GIS survey mapping data, and photographs included in the paper version.



For additional information, please contact Dr. Sulton at: annesulton@comcast.net



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

2. CRIME PREVENTION AND POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

a. Training Neighborhood Researchers

b. First Set of Focus Group Meetings

c. First Round of Surveys

d. Second Set of Focus Group Meetings

e. Second Round of Surveys

f. The Costs

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

a. First Set of Focus Group Meetings

b. First Round of Surveys

c. Second Set of Focus Group Meetings

d. Second Round of Surveys

5. PROPOSED FIVE-YEAR PLAN

a. The Plan and Its Implementation by the CAC, Residents, Businesses, Faith Community, and Police

b. Third Round of Surveys by Residents - Evaluation

c. Distributing Third Round Survey Results by CAC

d. Continuing the Plan and Evaluation

e. The Anticipated Costs

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7. REFERENCES

8. CRIME AND CRIME PREVENTION INFORMATION WEBSITES

9. APPENDIX

List of Focus Group Participants and Researchers

Round One and Round Two Surveys

CD-ROM with Data Sets in Excel Spreadsheets



INTRODUCTION

The Proposal:

The grant proposal contains a partially developed plan for conducting research, preventing crime, and improving police-community relations in a densely populated, urban, multi-ethnic, multi-lingual neighborhood, experiencing a variety of long-standing and seemingly intractable, serious crime and other "quality of life" problems. The grant proposal assumes: a) many neighborhood residents receive public assistance and/or need to be "empowered"; and b) relations between police and neighborhood residents are poor.

In the grant proposal, we listed "overarching goals" and proposed completing a series of distinct, yet inter-related activities to accomplish these goals. Essentially, the "overarching goals" are to conduct research on issues related to crime in the neighborhood, reduce crime in the neighborhood by improving the working relationships between neighborhood residents and police, and teach neighborhood residents how to collect data.

One of the unique aspects of the proposed research plan is building neighborhood residents' research capacity. We planned to hire and train two neighborhood residents to collect data. We proposed conducting five focus group meetings with neighborhood residents and police officers. The purposes of these meetings were to identify their perceptions of each other and to inform the development of surveys. We also planned to develop and administer surveys to collect data about neighborhood resident and police attitudes toward each other, crime prevention, and police-community relations.

We proposed designing a year-long program that involved directed police activities focused on: a) problem solving strategies that improved the linkages between neighborhood residents and police for crime intervention; and b) improving "quality of life" responses from police. The proposed directed police activities had the goals of increasing resident satisfaction with police services, reducing the number of neighborhood residents' "quality of life" calls to the police, and increasing neighborhood residents' perception of safety.

We also proposed keeping the community informed of the results of grant activities. We planned to distribute brochures and pamphlets to neighborhood residents and police officers.

The Reality:

Shortly after HUD funded the grant proposal, project staff met with some of the neighborhood leaders. Without question, the neighborhood leaders are an impressive group of committed, skilled, well-educated, and resourceful professionals. Most operate their own businesses in the neighborhood, serve as pastors of large congregations in

the neighborhood, or work in public or private sector management level positions in other parts of the metropolitan area.

Following these meetings with neighborhood leaders, I made dozens of visits to the neighborhood, visiting public housing complexes, churches, businesses, the library, and the post office. Sometimes, I just strolled down the streets or sat in the neighborhood park, listening to the rhythm of the neighborhood. From these experiences, I learned the census data, crime data, and other crime-related studies in Jersey City I reviewed (e.g., Mazerolle, et al., 1999) did not adequately describe this neighborhood. It is more complex, intriguing and lively than the "hard data" conveyed.

I met with neighborhood residents, and police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood. I learned they are far more sophisticated than assumed by the proposed design of the grant application's crime prevention component.

I also met with owners of businesses in the neighborhood, and leaders of religious congregations in the neighborhood. I learned these two groups are crucially important resources for the resolution of the public safety problems facing this neighborhood. The crime prevention component of the grant proposal did not include these two key groups' active participation.

The remedy was obvious - we needed to "adjust our sails" and take advantage of this unexpected "windfall" of pre-existing and readily available talent and other valuable neighborhood resources. Although we needed to "adjust our sails," our charge remained the same. We needed to fashion, for this particular neighborhood, a strategy specifically designed to: a) address residents' public safety concerns; and b) improve police-community relations.

The absence of a fully developed plan in the grant proposal was fortuitous because this situation presented an opportunity for the project to naturally evolve as we learned more about this neighborhood and the people living and working there. This opportunity was an unanticipated gateway or door through which the creativity and ingenuity of those living with the public safety problems could enter, and ultimately shape, the plan's final design.



CRIME PREVENTION AND POLICE COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Crime Prevention:

Crime prevention is an art. It is not yet a science, in part, because there currently is no consensus about the etiology or extent of crime. Hundreds of sociological, psychological, biological, and legal theories, and scores of criminology and criminal justice theoretical paradigms, swirl through the air like crisp leaves on a brisk autumn day.

In this new century, we still do not know how much crime occurs. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's annual reports, entitled *Crime in the U.S.*, tell us about 12 million serious crimes are reported to police each year. The federal government's Bureau of Justice Statistics' victimization surveys tell us almost twice this number of crimes actually occur. We still are just learning how to define and measure the "success" of those crime prevention approaches introduced in the early 1970s and with which we still are experimenting.

When neighborhood residents and the police patrolling their neighborhoods declare they want to prevent crime, all involved should know the task is daunting. This is serious business. None know the price of failure more than the nearly 150,000 American families burying loved ones falling prey to the crime of murder in the last decade.

Crime prevention is action-oriented. It involves actions that occur before the criminal incident occurs (Lejins, 1965). These actions are designed to stop or to prevent the crime from occurring (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973). In other words, crime prevention is "the anticipation, recognition, and appraisal of a crime risk and the initiation of some action to remove or reduce the risk" (National Crime Prevention Institute, 1978).

Crime Prevention Theory:

Although it is an action-oriented art, crime prevention has a theoretical basis. Crime prevention theory considers a broad array of variables or factors, at both the micro and macro levels of analyses (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973; Sulton, 1996; Rosenbaum, et al., 1998). Crime prevention theory asks: "How can we prevent crime?" The primary emphasis frequently is not on explaining "why" crime occurs.

For example, we know burglaries usually occur when people are away from home. We also know most burglars do not want to get caught breaking into a home and they take steps to avoid arrest. In this case, crime prevention theory would not primarily focus on asking: "What causes a person to burglarize a home?" Rather, the question posed is: "What measures or steps can we take to prevent the burglary?" The answer might be: "A bigger lock, a brighter light, a security alarm system."

The theoretical underpinnings of contemporary crime prevention strategies have some of their origins in the work of Dr. Peter Lejins. During the mid 1960s, Lejins identified three types of crime prevention approaches: mechanical, punitive and corrective.

According to Lejins (1965), mechanical crime prevention involves putting into place some type of physical barrier so that people cannot commit crimes. Punitive prevention involves incarcerating offenders so they are physically unable to commit new crimes in the community. Corrective prevention entails identifying variables or factors likely related to crime and then putting into place some strategies or programs that will address these factors.

Corrective prevention is particularly difficult because there is no consensus about what causes crime. At its core, American policing is re-active. Further complicating matters, when working at the neighborhood level, the conduct of those persons targeted for change are not strangers to the change agents.

Crime Prevention Practice:

Thousands of public agencies and civic organizations operate hundreds of variations of popular crime prevention programs. Millions of Americans participate in these programs. Billions of dollars are spent each year to operate these programs. The National Crime Prevention Council and the National Crime Prevention Coalition are among the best sources of information about currently operating crime prevention programs.

Among the most visible crime prevention programs are Neighborhood Block Watch, Drug Abuse Resistance Education a/k/a DARE, Weed and Seed, Citizen Patrols such as the Guardian Angels, Operation Identification to mark valuables, Children Identification to help with missing children cases, National Night Out, and Stop the Violence Start the Love Campaign. In many cases, the local police department assumes a leadership position, directing the program and encouraging residents to participate.



Many programs are collaborations between local police departments and local school districts. Hundreds of school-based programs focus on changing the conduct of children. Some focus on preventing school violence and other crimes occurring on school property. Others discourage children from engaging in potentially harmful and/or criminal conduct such as smoking cigarettes, using drugs, joining gangs, handling firearms, or arranging personal meetings with strangers found through the Internet.

Some crime prevention programs teach adults how to avoid victimization. Such programs show adults how they can prevent home burglary, car theft, identity theft, or fraud. Other programs focus on more difficult issues, such as domestic violence, abuse

of the elderly in nursing homes, sexual abuse of disabled persons, or drug addiction (Sulton, 1990).



"Crime prevention through environmental design" is another popular crime prevention strategy. These crime prevention programs blend "target hardening," community building, and changes to the physical environment. "Target hardening" is mechanical crime prevention - bigger locks or surveillance cameras would be used to discourage potential offenders. Community building seeks to empower neighborhood residents so that they take ownership of and responsibility for the welfare of the neighborhood. Changes to the physical environment might take the form of more and brighter street lights, closing streets to reduce traffic, tearing down or re-modeling abandoned buildings, removing graffiti, or preventing vandalism.

One of the most unique vandalism prevention programs was conducted in the mid 1970s by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. It operated an experimental tenant security patrol program in a Jersey City public housing complex. Tenants were recruited to voluntarily patrol the premises to discourage damage to recent renovations.

Do any of these strategies or programs prevent crime? We certainly hope so.

Crime Prevention Research:

At this time, there is little empirical evidence to support the notion that crime prevention programs actually prevent crime. It currently is fashionable to look at the number of crimes reported to police as the measure of "success". Obviously, empirical data showing apparent reductions in the numbers or rates of crime are important indicators of program effectiveness. However, we err if a "reduction" is the only variable or factor considered when evaluating whether a specific crime prevention program works. After all, we begin the evaluation or research process not knowing how much crime actually occurred **before** the crime prevention program began.

For example, in some multi-cultural neighborhoods, we find some residents' cultural practices discourage them from reporting crimes to police. [See for example Ron Cowart's Dallas program noted in Sulton, 1990.] One measure of the "success" of a crime prevention program, operating in a multi-cultural neighborhood, should be increased reporting of crime by those residents previously not reporting crime. Thus, the number of crimes reported after the crime prevention program might be higher. Therefore, to conclude that such a crime prevention program failed is absurd.

Sherman, et al. (1999) completed an extensive review of crime prevention literature, focusing on evaluations of crime prevention programs funded by the federal government. They suggest crime prevention can move beyond art to science.

Using crime reduction as a measure of program success, Sherman, et al. (1999) conclude many popular crime prevention strategies do not work. Among these are programs emphasizing "community mobilization against crime in high-poverty areas," Drug Abuse Resistance Education a/k/a DARE, "school-based leisure-time enrichment programs," "neighborhood watch programs organized with police," "increased arrests or raids on drug market locations," and "storefront police officers." The Sherman, et al. (1999) conclusions challenge conventional wisdom about the utility and efficacy of these strategies.

Although the Sherman, et al. (1999) report is useful, it is important not to lose sight of their central conclusion. They state: "The central conclusion of the report is that the current development of scientific evidence is inadequate to the task of policymaking. Many more impact evaluations using stronger scientific methods are needed before even minimally valid conclusions can be reached about the impact on crime of programs costing billions each year." Essentially, this means we have much work to do before we can definitively say, even in general terms, what works to prevent crime.

At this time, we do not know whether a neighborhood-based crime prevention program, blending and implementing several strategies simultaneously, and relying on private funding, might "work" to prevent crime. This is a complex and unanswered question.

Police-Community Relations:

The definition of the term "police-community relations" has changed dramatically over the past few decades. During the turbulent 1960s and 1970s, it really meant a public relations campaign - with police trying to promote the idea that they are not racist, brutal or unprofessional as many critics alleged.

Currently, police-community relations is a "generic" term, generally referring to police strategies designed to increase "proactive citizen involvement" in crime control efforts (Champion, 2001). According to Hunter, et al. (2000), police-community relations involve "complicated and constantly changing interactions" among police, other government agents, and private groups and individuals. These "interactions" attempt "to involve the citizen actively in determining what (and how) police services will be provided to the community and in establishing ongoing mechanisms for resolving problems of mutual interest to the community and the police" (Hunter, et al., 2000).

Essentially, the primary goal of police-community relations programs is to prevent crime. The strategy involves increasing the trust between police and the people police are sworn to serve and protect. The purpose of increasing the trust is to reduce residents' reluctance to help police as police respond to crime problems. Police realize they, working alone, cannot control or prevent crime. Citizens too are cognizant of the fact that they can and should play a collective or individual role in preventing crime.

Community Policing:

Community policing is one of the vehicles by which we hope to reach our objective of increasing the trust and our goal of preventing crime. According to Miller and Hess (2002), "Community policing is a philosophy that emphasizes working proactively with citizens to reduce fear, solve crime-related problems and prevent crime." Walker (2001) explains that the "core principles include developing close working relationships with neighborhood residents and responding to particular community needs."

Dr. Lee P. Brown, a criminologist and former police chief and now serving as Houston's mayor, is one of the visionaries of community policing. In or about 1982, while serving as Houston's police chief, Brown designed and implemented a program wherein the police department adopted values emphasizing the identification and resolution of problems and collaboration with residents to address these problems. The values include delivering police services in a manner that reinforces the concept of neighborhoods. Consequently, the strategy changed police patrol beats to coincide with natural neighborhood boundaries. Police officers are assigned to patrol a particular neighborhood, encouraged to meet with neighborhood leaders, and learn as much about the neighborhood as possible (Brown, 1987; 1989).

Community Policing Practice:

Community policing, as a strategy, is very popular. This idea "has swept the country," in part, because it "represents a philosophy of policing rather than a specific set of activities and tactics" (Walker, 2001). Billions of dollars in federal government funding also propelled this strategy into the national spotlight.

Hundreds of local police departments throughout the United States employ some type of community policing program. The program does not always have the name "community policing." For example, in Chicago, it is called the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy or CAPS (Skogan, et al., 2002).

According to Skogan, et al. (2002), since its inception in 1993, CAPS trained police officers in problem solving and re-organized them into smaller police beats. Police officers were able to respond to a wide range of problems identified by residents, such as graffiti and abandoned cars.

Community Policing Research:

"Crime prevention is a large part, in fact a cornerstone, of community policing" (Miller and Hess, 2002). Consequently, crime rates are used to measure the effectiveness of community policing. However, as Miller and Hess (2002) caution: "Crime statistics are seldom sufficient to understand the extent and character of a particular strategy's impact."

Walker (2001) contends: "The jury is still out on the impact of the community policing movement." However, initial evaluations suggest this strategy holds great promise for improving police community relations and preventing crime.

Hawdon, et al. (2003) report police officers' presence in the neighborhood improved residents' opinions of police. Skogan, et al. (2002) found most residents "rated police positively on demeanor, responsiveness and performance." Skogan, et al. (2002) also found crime rates decreased, with a 50 percent reduction in reported robbery and gun-related offenses. However, they note: "The extent to which such declines can be attributed to CAPS is unknown, but an earlier community policing experiment in Chicago found that CAPS was effective at reducing crime."

Also of great importance is the potential usefulness of this strategy when working with multi-cultural neighborhoods. According to Davis and Miller (2002), the community policing approach may help immigrants, from countries with repressive governments, overcome their distrust of authorities.

Lessons Learned:

In the early 1970s, we initiated many of the crime prevention strategies currently used. Among the most important lessons learned is that "there is no single solution to the crime problem. Indeed, actions designed to combat one type of crime may have no impact on another" (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973).

We have learned not all crime problems are amenable to resolution through our contemporary crime prevention and community policing strategies. There are some crime problems neighbors and police, even when working together, cannot plan to prevent. Among the most obvious of these are serial murders and serial rapes.

We now know neighbors and police, working together, can prevent some of the good guys from doing some bad things and some of the bad guys from doing some bad things. We have seen anecdotal evidence suggesting some success in the prevention of some crimes, including, but not limited to, open-air drug dealing, street corner prostitution solicitations, gunfights between rival gang members, identity theft, and retailers' inventory shrinkage resulting from shoplifting and employee theft.

We have not yet seen evidence that crime prevention and community policing strategies can prevent the determined criminal from committing heinous crimes. These predators will continue to haunt our society. However, working together, residents and police can develop plans to quickly apprehend even the most heinous offenders. The "Amber Alert" program and America's Most Wanted TV show are good examples of what private citizens and police can do - even when offenders travel across jurisdictional boundaries.

We have learned a neighborhood-level analysis and a neighborhood-level strategy might hold the greatest promise for preventing crime. Experience has taught us a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach increases opportunities to positively impact the lives of those we hope to affect. And we have learned it usually is best to focus on a specific type of crime problem and develop a strategy that might help prevent the specific problem identified.

Perhaps the most important lesson we have learned is that the voices of the people living with the problems must be heard and their ideas must be incorporated into the plan before the plan is set in stone. Their voices and ideas are not "incidental" to the crime prevention effort - they are essential (Foster, 2002).

Crime prevention strategies cannot be "parachuted" into a neighborhood. They must be grounded in the reality experienced by the people living and working in the neighborhood. As Queen Mother Falaka Fattah (2003), one of the founders of the internationally-acclaimed House of Umoja in Philadelphia now in its 35th year of operating a grassroots crime prevention program, explains: "Crime prevention programs parachuted or imported into a community will not go well. The program must come from the ground up. The grassroots community must take ownership of the program. Once a community is really involved with it, then the community will keep it going. It becomes a part of the fabric of the community, similar to how our churches and other community institutions last from generation to generation. External funding is not determinative of the continued existence of a crime prevention strategy because community members will volunteer to keep it going."

Without question, to be effective, a crime prevention strategy must incorporate the ideas of and empower the people affected by the problems. Empowerment requires ownership of the plan, a willingness to address the problems, and the ability to implement the plan.

Our Approach:

Consistent with the theoretical frameworks mentioned herein, review of other crime prevention and community policing programs, and the grant proposal's stated goals and activities, the COPC crime prevention component uses an approach that seeks to:

- 1) identify the specific public safety problems currently facing the Lafayette / Morris Canal neighborhood that might be amenable to concerted action by the people living and working in the neighborhood;
- 2) identify the obstacles or impediments to the reduction or prevention of these public safety problems; and
- 3) develop a plan of action that people living and working in the neighborhood are willing and able to implement.



RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction:

The grant proposal refers to my participation in this project as a "principal investigator." However, my actual role is that of an advisor providing technical assistance. I listened to the voices of those living and working in the neighborhood. I incorporated their ideas into the proposed plan.

The neighborhood liaison, Mrs. Rosalyn Browne, has actively participated in all aspects of the research effort. Her participation has been key to on-site management of all researchers and coordinating the research effort in the neighborhood. Without question, it would not have been possible to obtain the level of participation of residents, police officers, and neighborhood businesses absent the key role Mrs. Rosalyn Browne has played. She is a well-respected businessperson and activist in the neighborhood. Because she heads the Communipaw Avenue Block Association, Mrs. Rosalyn Browne has been able to marshal the existing neighborhood and police resources needed to pursue our ambitious research agenda. Mrs. Rosalyn Browne's leadership was critically important to this research effort.

Neighborhood Researchers:

In early September 2002, I met with neighborhood leaders and asked them to help me find neighborhood residents interested in learning how to do research, including collecting data from other neighborhood residents. I drafted and distributed hundreds of fliers in the neighborhood, advising residents of the COPC crime prevention component and advertising the availability of two neighborhood researcher positions. Third, at the request of neighborhood leaders, I hired three neighborhood residents to help me collect data.

I purchased books on research methodology and focus group meetings, and gave copies of the books to the three neighborhood researchers and the neighborhood liaison. I instructed each to read sections of both books.

I also gave a series of formal research methods lectures at the Monumental Baptist Church (a neighborhood church) and on the New Jersey City University campus. These lectures were attended by the three neighborhood researchers and the neighborhood liaison. A couple of other interested persons also attended one or more of the lectures.

After the neighborhood researchers and neighborhood liaison were trained in basic research methods and focus group meetings, the neighborhood liaison and I met to discuss the organization and scheduling of the three initial focus group meetings mentioned in the grant proposal.

First Set of Focus Group Meetings:



Father Robert Skurla and business owner Audrey Jackson (center).

In late September 2002, we spread the word throughout the neighborhood about the proposed focus group meetings. We asked interested persons to contact the neighborhood liaison. More people than anticipated expressed an interest in participating in the focus group meetings. Among these persons were residents, police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood, owners of businesses in the neighborhood, and religious leaders of churches in the neighborhood.

In early October 2002, to inform the development of the first survey, we decided to hold six initial focus group meetings. The decision to increase the number of focus group meetings was based upon: a) our desire to include as many people as possible; b) our need to keep the focus groups relatively small; and c) an attempt to accommodate interested participants' varying work and family schedules.

During mid to late October 2002, a total of 37 neighborhood residents, business owners, religious leaders, and police officers participated in the initial six focus group meetings. Of this number, eight are police officers assigned to patrol this neighborhood. Mrs. Rosalyn Browne attended all of the focus group meetings and led some of the focus group discussions. The neighborhood researchers and other COPC staff also attended one or more of the focus group meetings.

All six initial focus groups were held in the neighborhood. We met in the Lafayette Gardens community center (a public housing complex), Monumental Baptist Church, Assumption All Saints Church, Kolonia Restaurant, Iglesia C.F.D. Salvacion Church, and Mahogany Café. Because the focus group meetings were scheduled around meal times, we provided food for participants.

Each focus group meeting lasted about 90 minutes. We asked the same standard questions of each group. Please note the emphasis was not on what should be done, but rather on what can be done. The questions asked were:

- 1) What is the most pressing crime problem currently facing the neighborhood?
- 2) What actions can residents or business owners take?
- 3) What actions can police take?
- 4) What is the second most pressing crime problem facing the neighborhood?

- 5) What actions can residents or business owners take?
- 6) What actions can police take?
- 7) Are you satisfied with police services?
- 8) What actions can residents or business owners take to improve police services?
- 9) What actions can police take to improve police services?
- 10) What actions can others take to prevent crime?

During the meetings, we wrote down the comments made. We did our best to accurately summarize the key points each participant raised during the meetings. We also created a chart categorizing the various responses.

Although we discussed troubling public safety issues and the participants were very serious and passionate about these issues, the focus group meetings were pleasant and fun. Participants were candid and frank. They appreciated the opportunity to have their voices heard and thanked us for holding the meetings. But they also clearly conveyed the message that they expected us to keep our promise and try to do something constructive to address the problems they identified.

We told the focus group participants we would use the information they shared with us to inform the development of some surveys we were preparing. We let them know we would survey neighborhood residents, police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood, and owners of businesses in the neighborhood.

First Round of Surveys:



Before we administered the surveys, we distributed thousands of fliers throughout the neighborhood to let the people living and working there know we soon would be coming to their homes and work places to administer a survey about the crime-related problems in the neighborhood. On one side of the flier, the message was in English. On the other side of the flier, the message was in Spanish.

In November 2002, using the information from the focus group meetings as my guide, I designed three separate surveys. I call these "first round" or "round one" surveys.

I then met with Community Advisory Council members (a group of neighborhood residents involved in providing some oversight for the COPC project) and asked them to review and approve these surveys. I also asked the New Jersey City University

Institutional Review Board to approve the surveys. All suggested changes were made to the surveys. We agreed only persons over age 18 would be surveyed.

I also needed and obtained the approval of the Jersey City Police Department to administer surveys to its police officers. This task was accomplished through the kind efforts of Mrs. Rosalyn Browne, Jersey City Police Department East District Commander and Captain Robert Kilduff, and Jersey City Police Department East District Community Relations Officer Bernie Chester.

From early December 2002 to February 2003, we began administering a slightly different survey to each of the following three groups: 1) neighborhood residents; 2) police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood; and 3) owners of businesses in the neighborhood. Copies of these surveys are attached to the Appendix.

Working, in part-time paid positions, to help me complete the first round of surveys were: three neighborhood resident researchers (one spoke Spanish fluently); one university graduate student having grown up in the neighborhood; a data coder; and the neighborhood liaison.

We went to every door in the neighborhood, in an attempt to give every household and every business in the neighborhood an opportunity to participate in our surveys. We went to police roll calls and administered our survey to police officers regularly assigned to patrol the COPC neighborhood. We even arranged to secure the participation of undercover narcotic officers in our survey - using a method that guarantees the protection of their identities.

I used some of my criminal justice students to administer the surveys to police officers. They were used because I believed the police officers would be more candid in their responses when dealing with my university students.

Round one surveys were administered to 341 neighborhood residents, 72 police officers patrolling the neighborhood, and 29 owners of businesses operating in the neighborhood. All 442 respondents are over the age of 18.

All personally identifying information collected from survey respondents was removed from and is stored separately from the responses to survey questions. We can report what people said as a group. There now is no way to determine who specifically said what in response to survey questions.

Second Set of Focus Group Meetings:



Father Eugene Squeo and business owner David Silverstein.

In April 2003, we held four additional focus group meetings with residents, business owners, religious leaders, and police officers.

Eleven persons, having attended the first set of focus group meetings, were invited to attend these focus group meetings. Ten of those invited attended the second set of focus group meetings. Mrs. Rosalyn Browne attended all of the focus group meetings and led some of the focus group discussions. The neighborhood researchers and other COPC staff also attended one or more of the focus group meetings. The meetings were held in Monumental Baptist Church and Mahogany Café.

As proposed, the purpose of these focus group meetings was to explore in greater depth some of the issues and concerns emanating from the round one surveys. The information obtained from these focus groups was used to inform the development of the second survey. We call this the "second round" or "round two" survey. A copy of this document is attached in the Appendix.

Second Round of Surveys:



The ten focus group meetings and first round of surveys helped refine our focus. The second round of surveys focused on collecting data on residents', police officers' and business owners' preferences for different crime prevention strategies. This decision was made on the basis of what focus group members and survey respondents said: a) are their perceptions of the nature and extent of crime and police-community relations in the COPC neighborhood; and b) they can do to prevent crime and improve police-community relations.

Using this information, I designed one survey to be administered to residents, police, and business owners. The survey was designed so that not all respondents would respond to all questions.

I then met with Community Advisory Council members and asked them to review and approve the "second round" or "round two" survey. I also asked the New Jersey City University Institutional Review Board to approve this survey. All suggested changes were made to the survey. We agreed only persons over age 18 would be surveyed.

I also needed and obtained the approval of the Jersey City Police Department to administer surveys to its police officers. This task was accomplished through the kind efforts of Mrs. Rosalyn Browne, Jersey City Police Department East District Commander and Captain Robert Kilduff, and Jersey City Police Department East District Community Relations Officer Bernie Chester.

I was not directly involved in the administration of the second round of surveys. I needed to test whether the lesson was learned. The only way to know whether I was

successful in building research capacity in the neighborhood was to step back and observe. I had to let the neighborhood residents take the lead in figuring out how best to accomplish their data collection objectives. I was available for consultation - I talked with Mrs. Rosalyn Browne on the telephone or we exchanged e-mails every week.

The neighborhood residents were very creative and figured out a way to "touch every door" in the neighborhood and to hire more neighborhood residents and university students to do the work. They stayed within the budget with which we had to work.

From late May 2003 until early July 2003, Working, in part-time paid positions, to complete the second round of surveys were: ten neighborhood resident researchers; three university students (at least one spoke Spanish fluently); a data coder; a survey verifier; and the neighborhood liaison.

Researchers went to every door in the neighborhood, in an attempt to give every household and every business in the neighborhood an opportunity to participate in our survey. When a resident was not home, they left a flier explaining their visit and indicating they would return. This flier was written in both English and Spanish. They developed a survey tracking system so that they could ensure comprehensive coverage of the entire neighborhood. They also went to police roll calls and administered the survey questionnaire to police officers regularly assigned to patrol the COPC neighborhood.

After all round two surveys were completed, I retained a university student, not previously connected in any way with the COPC project, to verify the surveys. We used a verification process because the researchers were inexperienced and I expected some errors would occur.

Using the cover sheets, containing personally identifying information, the survey verifier telephoned each survey respondent to verify one of our researchers came to his or her home or place of business and completed a survey. We also verified the completion of surveys through other researchers having worked in teams as the surveys were completed.

When a survey could not be verified, then that survey was placed in a separate pile and not included in our "ready to code data" box. Four researchers [two neighborhood residents and two university students] physically went to each address noted on the unverified surveys' cover sheets and attempted to confirm that the survey had been completed. An additional 21 surveys were added to the "ready to code data" box.

Note: During the time we were conducting our surveys, the Lafayette Gardens public housing complex was being dismantled and residents moved to other locations. Thus, some surveys could not be verified because some of the persons surveyed could not be located. Also, three surveys were administered to people living very near, but technically outside, the COPC neighborhood "boundaries" as we somewhat "artificially" defined the neighborhood when we drew its map in the grant proposal.

When a survey was verified, the respondent was asked if he or she wanted a copy of the research report. A few respondents indicated they wanted copies of this report and copies will be provided to them.

After a survey was verified, we triple-checked to make certain the survey was properly completed. We expected and found a few errors. All unverified surveys and all surveys having errors were discarded and are not included in our data. In our data set, 285 surveys were administered to neighborhood residents, 60 to police officers patrolling the neighborhood, and 19 to owners of businesses in the neighborhood. All 364 survey respondents are over the age of 18.

Following the verification process, the cover sheets, with the personally identifying information, were removed from the survey responses and are separately stored. There now is no way to connect a particular survey respondent to responses to survey questions. We know what the respondents said as a group - but we do not know who specifically said what.

The Costs:



The grant proposal anticipates we need a total of **\$66,219** of HUD money to complete the work of the crime prevention component. Of this amount, the total spent for the work done to date is only **\$38,424**. The majority of this money, over **\$22,000**, was spent to hire neighborhood residents to conduct surveys in their neighborhood. Most of the remaining money was spent to hire university students to assist in collecting/coding/verifying data and to neighborhood businesses to pay for preparing the food consumed during the focus group meetings. The rest of the money was spent to buy research methods and focus group books for neighborhood researchers and to make copies of fliers and surveys. My services are volunteered and are free of charge to this project.

This was an amazingly cost effective research effort. Seldom do researchers enjoy the luxury of doing a door-to-door survey because the costs usually are prohibitive.

We were able to keep the costs affordable, in part, because some people volunteered some of their time. Among these was Mrs. Rosalyn Browne. She even let us use her business office as a researcher meeting and survey storage place during the entire time we collected survey data - which took months. Sometimes people in the neighborhood fed us free of charge, or made copies free of charge, or used their cars to haul surveys without asking for gas money, or placed long distance telephone calls without billing it through to the project.

We saved thousands of dollars because people in this neighborhood supported our work. They supported it by taking time to attend focus group meetings and to respond to our surveys. But they also supported it with their contributions - which cost them money.

The methodology we used was hard work. It was mentally draining and physically exhausting. But it was a lot of fun too.



RESEARCH RESULTS

First Focus Groups:



We held all six initial focus group meetings in the neighborhood. One group was composed of all residents living in Lafayette Gardens (a public housing complex). The second group was composed of residents, business owners and religious leaders. The third group was composed of residents and religious leaders. The fourth and sixth groups were composed of police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood. The fifth group was composed of residents and police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood.

Most Pressing Crime Problem

Across the board, all six focus groups quickly identified illegal drug sales as the most pressing crime problem currently facing the neighborhood.

When asked what residents or businesses can do to address the drug problem, generally, focus group participants mentioned strategies that would enable residents and police to work cooperatively together. They went beyond simply suggesting residents call police to complain. They recommended they take concerted action that would include establishing a neighborhood block watch program with police, wherein residents and police would present a united front to oppose illegal drug dealing in the neighborhood.

Residents' fear of confronting drug dealers, who also are their neighbors, seems to be a major obstacle to prevention of this crime. According to some resident focus group members, some neighbors allow drug dealers to live with them. These focus group members said they can discourage these neighbors from providing homes to drug dealers. Resident focus group members also noted some neighbors alert drug dealers to police patrols. These focus group members said they can discourage their neighbors from doing this too.

Residents, business owners and religious leaders mentioned they can work to forge stronger relationships between churches and community organizations, establish community outreach programs to help drug addicts overcome their addictions, and create programs for youth to keep them off the streets.

When police officers were asked what residents or businesses can do to address the illegal drug sales problem, some police officers stated employers in the neighborhood should hire teenagers to keep them off the street. Others said residents should call the police department's narcotics tip line.

Residents, business owners, and religious leaders were asked what actions police can take to address the illegal drug sales problem. Generally, they want a quicker response time when they call police. Many said they want "constant and heavier police patrols," including foot patrol and community policing.

Police also responded to this question with a "wish list." Some want more police hired, updated equipment, and "more effective laws which would keep predators off the street." Police also mentioned several strategies that might help, including smaller posts with community policing, walking posts, and a "park and walk" program.

There seems to be a consensus on this point. Residents, business owners, religious leaders and police seem to believe that: a) police can deliver the type of service this neighborhood desires; and b) if police deliver the type of service this neighborhood desires, then the illegal drug sales problem can be effectively addressed.

Second Most Pressing Crime Problem

Opinions varied when focus groups were asked to identify the second most pressing crime problem currently facing the neighborhood. Responses included the "hard crimes" of rape, aggravated assault, and gunfire exchanged between or among those associated with illegal drug sales. Most of the responses focused on "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems.

The "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems identified were: vagrancy; kids loitering day and night and sometimes playing loud boombox music; liquor stores selling alcohol to minors; vandalism to business property such as broken windows; damage to personal property such as breaking off car mirrors; graffiti; garbage in the streets; drinking in public; littering of private property with liquor/beer bottles and crack vials; violation of curfew laws by children and teenagers; prostitution; and abandoned buildings because these allegedly are being used as "storefronts" for drug dealers. One church leader complained the main front entrance doors to the church were removed from their hinges and stolen from the church.

Responses to questions about what residents, businesses and police can do to address these crime problems are similar to those responses provided to questions about the most pressing crime problem. However, there are several important differences.

Focus group members emphasized the crucial role of parents in adequately monitoring the conduct of their children. Others noted the responsibilities of businesses to adhere to the law, e.g., stop selling alcohol to children, and stop tolerating illegal drug sales inside and outside their stores. And others explained police should be more knowledgeable of the neighborhood and its residents, perhaps through a community-based policing approach. They again noted preference for a "park and walk" police program.

Generally, police are satisfied with the job they do. The other focus group members are not. The sore points are perceived slow police response time to calls for assistance and not seeing enough police on patrol in the neighborhood.

When asked what could others do, the housing authority was mentioned by residents of Lafayette Gardens; the mayor's office was mentioned by the other five focus groups. Among the actions the housing authority can take are enforcing the current rules and limit or restrict who lives in and visits the complex. The actions the mayor's office can take to address the public safety problems are: hiring more police officers; creating recreational and training programs for youth to keep them off streets; reduce red tape for community street programs and church activities; and deter drug dealing by assisting residents in removing garbage, graffiti, and abandoned properties and lots.

In the final analysis, from the the six initial focus group meetings, we learned they believe: a) illegal drug dealing is the most pressing crime problem facing this neighborhood; b) police-community relations are not "poor" per se because dissatisfaction appears to be based on a desire for more police-resident interaction; and c) residents, businesses, religious leaders, and police are willing to work together to address public safety problems.

First Round of Surveys:



Consistent with the information obtained from the focus groups, neighborhood residents, owners of businesses in the neighborhood, and police officers patrolling the neighborhood indicate illegal drug sales is the most pressing crime problem currently facing this neighborhood. One hundred forty respondents identified illegal drug sales as the most pressing crime problem.

When asked what is the second most pressing crime problem currently facing this neighborhood, respondents mentioned illegal drug sales more frequently than any other crime problem. Illegal drug sales was identified by 88 persons as the second most pressing crime problem. Respondents also indicated a variety of other "hard crimes," including assaults, robbery, and theft. Among the "soft crimes" or "quality of life" problems identified are vandalism and loitering.

When asked what residents can do to address the drug sales problem, responses varied. Most residents said increase communication between police and residents or establish a neighborhood block watch program. One hundred six respondents listed this strategy.

When asked what police can do to address the drug sales problem, most residents said increase police presence in the neighborhood. One hundred thirty nine respondents listed this strategy.

When asked whether they are satisfied with police services, 67% of the residents said no. When asked what they like least about the police services provided, most respondents complained about the slow response time to calls for police service. This response seems a bit odd, because only 25 of the respondents indicated they had a face-to-face contact with a police officer in this neighborhood. This suggests most of the respondents never called police for service. If they had, the complaint most likely would be: "Police did not come when called." Evidently, something else is causing this concern about perceived slow response time.

In summary, the results of the first round of surveys indicate: a) illegal drug sales is the most pressing crime problem currently facing this neighborhood; b) "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems are of major concern to residents and business owners; c) communication between police and the neighborhood they serve is a major concern to the police and to neighborhood residents and businesses and is seen as an obstacle to preventing "hard crime" and "soft crime" in the neighborhood; d) most respondents are not satisfied with police services and want police to increase their presence in the neighborhood and reduce their response time to calls for assistance; and e) neighborhood residents and business owners are willing to work with police to address the neighborhood's public safety concerns.

Second Set of Focus Group Meetings:



John Jayme and Rosalyn Browne

Four additional focus group meetings were held with residents, business owners, religious leaders, and police officers. The purpose of these focus group meetings was to explore in greater depth some of the issues and concerns emanating from the round one surveys.

I took the box containing the 442 first round survey responses to these focus group meetings. Focus group members reviewed the survey responses. For the second round survey, they suggested we narrow our focus and examine neighborhood preferences for specific strategies to address the public safety concerns. They also talked about specific public safety strategies that might work in this neighborhood.

One particularly fascinating meeting occurred in Monumental Baptist Church. Rev. Jones, the pastor of this church, stopped by to observe and lend his support to our efforts by his presence. The exchange of ideas between Rev. Jones and police officer Scott McNulty was amazing. Rev. Jones mentioned that when it is cold outside he gives police officers access to the church so that they have a warm place to stop while on patrol duty. Officer McNulty noted people frequently overlook the small human things police officers need. Our discussion was frank and insightful.

Note: Officer McNulty was one of my university students, taking a class I taught on police-community relations. We enjoyed this unique opportunity to work together and move beyond theory to practice. Officer McNulty recently replaced Officer Bernie Chester as the East District Police Community Relations Officer. Officer Chester was transferred to another district and will be missed by this neighborhood.

Consistent with the focus group members' directions, I designed a survey that listed the 15 most frequently mentioned things residents, businesses, and police said they can do to address the public safety concerns. I added questions about whether residents and businesses are willing to spend their time and money to make these things happen. I also added a few questions to gather data on respondents' demographic characteristics.

Second Round of Surveys:



In our data set, 364 respondents answered our survey questions. Two hundred eighty five are neighborhood residents; 60 are police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood; and 19 are owners of businesses located in the neighborhood.

From a list of 15 different crime prevention strategies, respondents were asked to select their top three choices for a crime prevention strategy in their neighborhood. Among the most frequently indicated first choices are: increasing police presence in the neighborhood; hiring more police officers; establishing a neighborhood block watch program; and increasing exchange of information with police. These four strategies also frequently were mentioned as second or third choice. Providing after-school activities for children frequently was mentioned as second or third strategy of choice.

Residents and business owners were asked whether they are willing to spend their time and/or money to support the crime prevention strategies they preferred. The majority of those responding to these questions said they are willing to spend their time (157 or 52%) - many indicating over five hours per month. About one-third (110 or 37%) of the people responding to these questions said they are willing to spend their money - many indicating over \$5 per month.

The responses to these two questions are critical. They help reveal whether people are willing and believe they are able to implement the crime prevention strategy or strategies of their choice. This is an important step toward empowerment.

In summary, based upon the ten focus group meetings and responses to the four surveys, it appears people living and working in this neighborhood believe they need and are able to implement a multi-faceted strategy to prevent crime and improve police-community relations.

THE PROPOSED FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Introduction:

In my role as a technical advisor, I promised the Community Advisory Council I would take the information obtained from the focus group meetings and surveys and try to specifically tailor, for this particular neighborhood, a plan to help prevent crime and improve police-community relations.

I propose a five-year plan, in part, because this neighborhood is in transition. The large scale HOPE VI public housing project is changing housing patterns. The neighborhood park is undergoing a major renovation. Large buildings, standing as abandoned eyesores for over 20 years, are being transformed into attractive affordable housing. Neighborhood activists are forging new relationships and forming politically powerful neighborhood revitalization advocacy groups. A short-term plan would be inconsistent with the current reality of this neighborhood.

The proposed plan is nothing more than a proposed plan. The Community Advisory Council can accept this plan as proposed. It can reject this plan in total. It can modify this plan to suit its preferences. The responsibility to do something to address this neighborhood's long-standing and serious public safety concerns rests with the people living and working in this neighborhood.

The proposed plan is multi-faceted. It seeks to marshal existing neighborhood resources and build upon the strengths of the current good relationship between the neighborhood and the police working therein.

This plan assumes the government of Jersey City will **not** spend any additional funds to hire police, or for any other purpose connected with the implementation of this plan.

This plan assumes the people living and operating businesses in this neighborhood will completely finance the operations of this plan. This is a second step toward empowerment.

The Site:

The plan needs a home - a physical site from which it can operate. I propose the small lot on the corner of Halliday and Communipaw Avenue be selected as the site for this plan.

The lot is owned by Jersey City. It sits near the heart and is at the crossroads of this neighborhood. During the two years I have visited this neighborhood, the lot has been filled with garbage. It is an ugly eyesore. Transforming this space into a center of

operations for a strategy to prevent crime and improve police-community relations will be beneficial in many ways.

The Communipaw Avenue Block Association has asked the appropriate government officials to lease this land to the Association for \$1 per month so this plan will have a physical site.

Assuming this lot can be leased from the city, on this lot a small trailer will be placed. The trailer will include restroom facilities, a small refrigerator, a coffee maker, a telephone, a desk or table, a couple of chairs, and a telephone answering machine. It will be heated in the winter and cooled in the summer. The entrance door will have a mail slot so that papers can be left for reading by those entering the trailer.

The CAC:

The Community Advisory Council, using those neighborhood residents having completed the COPC leadership training component, will be responsible for over site of the plan's implementation. The talents and skills of these long-term neighborhood residents must be marshaled to lead the neighborhood in efforts designed to prevent crime and improve police-community relations.

The talents and skills of those neighborhood residents participating in the COPC economic development component also will be critical to success of the plan. The business sector of the neighborhood will play a lead role in ensuring the funds needed to implement the plan are available. Obviously, the business sector of the neighborhood stands to prosper if the neighborhood is perceived as a safe place in which to conduct business.

The Businesses and Faith Community:

Business owners and churches can help implement this plan by ensuring the money needed to purchase the trailer and to pay the monthly bills is available.

The Residents:

The Adults

Adult residents of the neighborhood can support the plan by providing information to police about "hard crimes" and "soft crimes" or "quality of life" problems. Adult residents' fear of retaliation by illegal drug dealers and other offenders is justified. However, this fear should not paralyze adults to the extent they refuse to call the police department's narcotics tip line or call the "site" and leave an anonymous telephone message. This small effort can help police identify and apprehend these offenders. Adults also can counsel their children to avoid situations wherein people are selling and/or using illegal drugs.

Adults can take better care of their property to make it look better. Picking up someone else's garbage is a pain - but if the garbage is lying in front of one's home, then the homeowner or renter should pick it up and properly dispose of it. This should take no more than a few minutes a day.

Adults can better supervise their children. This adults should do to ensure their children are safe and not victims of crime. As importantly, adults should supervise their children to ensure their children's actions are not offensive to their neighbors. A parent should not allow his or her child to be down the street, in the middle of the night, loudly playing a boombox or hanging out in front of a neighborhood business. The excuse that "kids have no place to go" is just not good enough. Supervision of children always is the responsibility of parents. Does this mean parents need to organize productive and fun activities for their children - absolutely.

To the extent parents need help in organizing productive and fun activities for children in the neighborhood, the COPC leadership component graduates should take the lead in developing programs for children in the neighborhood.

The Children

Children should be involved in helping to implement the plan. First, the "site" needs a name. I suggest elementary school children, attending the P.S. 22 Elementary School, which is across the street from the Rev. Ercel Webb Park (a neighborhood park currently being renovated), be asked to name the "site." A contest could be held, with a \$75 prize for the winning entry.

Middle school children can help implement the plan by designing the "site's" foundation. The suggested small trailer should leave room for the laying of a bricked walkway, with as many as 600 small bricks. These bricks could be purchased by the CommuniPaw Avenue Block Association (CABA) at a cost of about \$1 per brick. As a fundraising activity, CABA could sell these bricks to neighborhood residents and businesses and other supporters for \$10 per brick. The middle school children could be hired to paint the bricks at a cost of \$2 per brick painted. The result would be a mosaic art form of brightly colored bricks painted by children in the neighborhood and for which the children were paid. This also would be a nice after school program for children. Middle school or other art teachers probably will need to be consulted to figure out the best materials to use to paint the bricks.

High school teenagers can help implement the plan by preparing the ground for installation of the bricks, installing the bricks, and painting the trailer. These teenagers would be paid for their work from the funds generated through the sale of the bricks or other private donations made by the supporters of the plan. The result would be a nice looking "site" designed and completed by teenagers in the neighborhood and for which the teenagers were paid. This also would be a nice after school program for teenagers.

All applications for the "site" naming contest and paying jobs should be available **only** at the public library in the neighborhood, located near the intersection of Communipaw and Pacific. The applications should not be at the front desk - near the library's entrance. The applications should not conveniently be placed on a table in the library. Rather, the applications should be placed in magazine type holders located in several different places in the library's book stacks. This will require applicants to look on the stacks to find the applications - learning the important lesson that the library is a place where knowledge can be freely obtained.

The Police:

The grant proposal states we will implement a strategy that will "involve directed police activities designed to focus on problem solving strategies." This approach seems too narrow because its emphasis is on what the police should do. We have shifted a bit and now focus on what the police, neighborhood residents, neighborhood businesses, and the faith community can do together to address issues of crime and police-community relations. This approach is better suited to this neighborhood because our work to date shows there is an impressive reservoir of support for police from neighborhood residents, owners of businesses in the neighborhood, and religious leaders in the neighborhood.

The role of the police, in implementing the plan proposed herein, is key. When police were asked what they can do about the public safety problems in this neighborhood, among the things they frequently mentioned are: a) smaller posts with community policing; b) walking posts; c) "park and walk" program; d) neighborhood block watch; and e) exchanging information with neighborhood residents. Some noted they need more discretion to do their job. All of these ideas are consistent with the philosophy of community policing. If these things are done, then perhaps the major complaint of residents and businesses would be addressed - they want an increase in police presence and visibility.

The reality is that many police officers do not want to do community policing work. They prefer to work on the "hard crime" problems. The "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems seem like social work. In their view, they are crime fighters - not social workers.

On the other hand, some police officers enjoy community policing work. In their view, spending time responding to "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems is worthwhile, in part, because it helps them nip in the bud potentially more serious problems and often provides valuable leads to resolve the "hard crime" problems.

This proposed plan acknowledges and respects the views of both groups of officers. This plan does not ask the police department to direct officers to do anything. In fact, this plan assumes the police department will not: a) increase the number of officers assigned to patrol this neighborhood; b) change its police patrol patterns; or c) ask its police officers to do anything special.

Rather, this plan invites those officers willing to do community policing work to "do it to the max" in this neighborhood. This plan respectfully requests the police department give these officers the discretion they need to do this work.

There are about 100 police officers assigned to patrol the East District, which includes this neighborhood. Let us assume only 10 of these officers choose to visit the "site" each week, and while there they spend about 15 minutes reviewing any complaints or other crime-related information left there by neighborhood residents, having a hot cup of coffee, or using the restroom facilities. The result would be, each week, a police car would be parked outside the "site" for 150 minutes. This gives the neighborhood over two hours of increased police presence and visibility without any additional cost to the police department.

An officer, choosing to stop by the "site," might review information he or she thinks it wise to check out right away. This officer might decide to do a "park and walk," leaving his or her squad car at the "site" and walking a block or so down the street. If five police officers each week decide to respond to information in this fashion, and it takes them an average of 20 minutes to complete this task, then it gives the neighborhood an additional 100 minutes of visible police presence without any additional cost to the police department.

Police also could stop by the "site" and leave crime-related information. There might be information about a missing child or a wanted fugitive the police need to circulate throughout the neighborhood. The "site" can and should be used to exchange information that is beneficial to both the police and the neighborhood.

Obviously, an essential feature of this proposed plan is officers self-selecting or voluntarily choosing to do community policing work as a part of their regular patrol responsibilities. But patrol officers can only make this choice if the police department gives them the discretion or flexibility to visit the "site" and to follow up on information received when these police officers believe it is prudent.

This is a departure from how patrol officers frequently are assigned to perform their duties. Usually, when the police department receives a call for service, the call is prioritized. The "hard crime" calls are the first to have an officer dispatched. The "soft crime" or "quality of life" calls get a response when time permits, which sometimes is a day or two later. Frequently, the complainant on a "soft crime" or "quality of life" call is told the complaint only will be taken by telephone and not to expect a police officer to make a personal visit.

This is precisely the problem about which scores of neighborhood residents and businesses complain. One of our neighborhood resident focus group members described in detail the utter frustration she feels when she calls the police. According to this 30 plus year resident, crack and marijuana smoke float into her window every day. Open-air drug dealing occurs under her window every day. The place does not vary.

The times vary little. But, this is a low priority call. By the time police arrive, the offenders have left.

A police officer choosing to visit the "site" and seeing or hearing this type of complaint might decide it wise to just walk a block or so down the street and check it out. But this officer needs the discretion to make this decision.

Allowing police officers to stop by the "site" when they deem it appropriate, given their schedules and other patrol responsibilities, holds promise for addressing simultaneously several concerns expressed by both residents and police. This strategy is a version of what we hope a neighborhood block watch program can be. It can facilitate an increase in the exchange of information about crime problems and police operations between or among police, residents, and business owners in the neighborhood. It should increase police presence and visibility in the neighborhood. It might facilitate an increase in the speed with which police respond to residents' and business owners' complaints about crime problems in the neighborhood, particularly the "soft crime" or "quality of life" complaints. It could increase enforcement of laws - not necessarily through more arrests or tickets - but certainly by letting people know police are responding to a broader range of complaints. And, it should encourage residents and business owners to cooperate with efforts to prosecute alleged offenders after an arrest is made.

Certainly, we can expect that even if only five police officers per week choose to visit the "site" for a few minutes and respond each week to just a couple of the complaints left there, police-community relations will improve.

To help measure the effectiveness of this part of the proposed plan, police choosing to visit the "site" will need to keep track of the complaints to which they respond and share this information with neighborhood residents and business owners. There are several ways in which this could be done.

For example, police visiting the "site" could leave notes in the "site" indicating the nature of the complaints and their responses thereto. These notes could be collected and reviewed by the Community Advisory Council. The notes could be collected by the East District Commander or Police Community Relations Officer. They then could meet with the Community Advisory Council once every month or two to report on the work done as a result of officers stopping by the "site."

To the extent possible, it might be useful for the police department to use its "crime mapping" technology to determine whether this plan has any statistically significant effect on the type or number of service calls received from this neighborhood.

Third Round of Surveys by Residents:

To date, a dozen neighborhood residents have been involved in collecting survey data. Some of these residents, working with the Community Advisory Council, should develop a third round of surveys.

The surveys should be administered sometime during mid to late summer 2004. The purpose of completing the third round of surveys is to evaluate residents', businesses' and police officers' perceptions of whether the plan has helped to prevent or reduce "hard crime," "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems, and improve police-community relations.

There are many ways to collect survey data. Residents could do a door-to-door survey, similar to the way in which the first and second round surveys were done. They could designate certain days and hours to visit businesses, churches, and/or key street corners to survey passersby. They also could leave surveys at the "site" and ask people stopping or passing by the "site" to fill out surveys.

The third round survey should include some of the questions asked in the first and second rounds of surveys. A few new questions probably should be added, such as: "Are police-community relations better now than before the 'site' was opened?"

The survey approach adopted also should be organized in a way that leaves no doubt the information presented accurately reflects what people said. There should be some sort of verification process to ensure the integrity of the data collected. Expect that some errors will occur, and plan how best to identify and deal with these errors.

Dissemination of Third Round Survey Results by CAC:

The Community Advisory Council should take responsibility to disseminate or distribute the results of the third round of surveys. This can be done by circulating fliers and brochures, as noted in the grant proposal. It can be done using the local newspapers and local cable TV channel. Dissemination also can be accomplished by posting information on the websites of public agencies and private organizations.

Continuing the Plan and Evaluation:

The responsibility for continuing the plan rests with the people living and working in this neighborhood. Changes should be made as circumstances warrant. One change that probably should not be made is moving from private funding to government funding. A cornerstone of empowerment is ownership. Ownership comes with private funding. A neighborhood cannot really own that which it does not fund.

I suggest data be collected again during the summer of 2006 and summer of 2008. The information obtained should be used to refine the plan.

The Anticipated Costs:



For the "site," I expect it will cost a few thousand dollars to purchase a small trailer. This assumes the trailer is not new and needs some TLC or minor remodeling.

To operate the "site," monthly expenses for water, electricity and telephone should not exceed \$200. Per year, it should cost less than \$3,000 to keep the "site" operating.

For the third round of surveys, I expect this work can be done for as little as \$9,000. Of this amount \$500 should be earmarked for survey copying costs; \$1,000 for the person providing on-site administrative over site of the researchers; \$6,500 for the neighborhood researchers; and \$1,000 for someone to verify and code the data.

This estimate assumes three or more neighborhood researchers would be hired and paid on a per survey completed and verified basis of \$15 - which should yield about 400 completed and verified surveys. It is now time for a neighborhood resident to be trained to code the data collected, using Excel or some other spreadsheet computer software. New Jersey City University could provide this training. Assuming the data verifier/coder is paid \$10 per hour to verify and code data, this would yield 100 hours of work - which should be an adequate amount of time to complete all survey verification and coding work.



SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have accomplished the "overarching goals" of conducting research on issues related to crime in the neighborhood, building research capacity in this neighborhood, and designing a strategy to address public safety problems and improve police-community relations. My work now is done.

Our research methodology and this proposed plan are unique. They are based upon the ideas and information obtained from hundreds of people living and working in this neighborhood.

If adopted by the Community Advisory Council, years will pass before we know whether this plan helps prevent or reduce crime in this neighborhood. I believe police-community relations already have improved.

The focus group meetings did more than direct the research effort. These frank and candid discussions among neighborhood residents, police officers assigned to patrol the neighborhood, business owners, and religious leaders enhanced all participants' understanding of and appreciation for the challenges before this neighborhood.

In the next year or so, the Community Advisory Council should consider exploring partnership opportunities with state law enforcement authorities. The illegal drug sales problem is not a neighborhood-level problem. It is a problem of international dimensions. Help from state level law enforcement officials will be required.

In time, the Community Advisory Council also should consider the role local courts can play in addressing the neighborhood's public safety problems. Sentencing options available to jurists and probation supervision strategies might provide some additional tools to deal with "soft crime" or "quality of life" problems.

And, it probably would be a nice gesture if the Community Advisory Council annually gave "neighborhood service" awards to those persons doing good work on behalf of the neighborhood, including police officers stopping by the "site" to do the work the neighborhood requests.

Thank you for allowing me to serve as your technical advisor. I wish you Godspeed as you continue your important work.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Lee P. 1987. "Innovative Policing in Houston." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 494:129-134.
- Brown, Lee P. 1989. "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials." *National Institute of Justice Perspectives on Policing* 12.
- Champion, Dean J. 2001. *The American Dictionary of Criminal Justice: Key Terms and Major Court Cases, Second Edition*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Davis, Robert and Joel Miller. 2002. "Immigration and Integration: Perceptions of Community Policing Among Members of Six Ethnic Communities in Central Queens, New York City." *International Review of Victimology* 9:93-111.
- Fattah, Queen Mother Falaka. 2003. Personal Interview via telephone on August 22.
- Foster, Janet. 2002. "People Pieces: The Neglected But Essential Elements of Community Crime Prevention." (From *Crime Control and Community: The New Politics of Public Safety*, p. 167-196, Gordon Hughes and Adam Edwards, eds.). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Hawdon, James and John Ryan. 2003. "Police-Resident Interactions and Satisfaction with Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 14:55-74.
- Hunter, Ronald, Pamela Mayhall and Thomas Barker. 2000. *Police-Community Relations and the Administration of Justice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lejins, Peter. 1965. Recent Changes in the Concept of Prevention. Reprint from the *Proceedings of the 95th Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association*.
- Mazerolle, Lorraine, Justin Ready, Bill Terrill and Frank Gajewski. 1999. *Problem-Oriented Policing in Public Housing: Final Report of the Jersey City Project*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Miller, Linda and Karen Hess. 2002. *The Police in the Community: Strategies for the 21st Century, Third Edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. 1973. *A National Strategy to Reduce Crime*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Crime Prevention Institute. 1978. "The Practice of Crime Prevention." *Understanding Crime Prevention* 1.

Rosenbaum, Dennis, Arthur Lurigio and Robert Davis. 1998. *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sherman, Lawrence, Denis Gottfredson, Doris MacKenzie, John Eck, Peter Reuter and Shawn Bushway. 1999. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Skogan, Wesley, Lynn Steiner, Jill DuBois, J. Erick Gudell and Aimee Fagan. 2002. *Taking Stock: Community Policing in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University.

Sulton, Anne T. 1990. *Inner City Crime Control: Can Community Institutions Contribute?* Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Sulton, Anne T. 1996. *African American Perspectives On: Crime Causation, Criminal Justice Administration and Crime Prevention*. Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Walker, Samuel. 2001. *Police Accountability: The Role of Citizen Oversight*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.



WEB SITES

Following is a list of some government agencies and private organizations from which reliable information about crime and crime prevention can be obtained. Clicking on the blue links below will take you to the websites.

Please consult your local public or school reference librarians to obtain additional information. For example, among the libraries having websites with links to a variety of criminal justice resources is New Jersey City University. The website address is <http://www.njcu.edu/Guarini/>

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
www.acjs.org

American Society of Criminology
www.asc41.com

Bureau of Justice Statistics
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs

Federal Bureau of Investigation
www.fbi.gov

National Crime Prevention Coalition
www.ncpc.org

National Crime Prevention Council
www.ncpc.org

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
www.ncjrs.org

National Institute of Justice
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij

Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics
www.albany.edu/sourcebook

U.S. Department of Justice
www.usdoj.gov

APPENDIX

List of Focus Group Participants and Researchers

Round One Survey for Residents

Round One Survey for Police Officers

Round One Survey for Businesses

Round Two Survey for Residents, Police and Businesses



FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS

Focus Group Facilitators

Rosalyn Browne
Dr. Anne T. Sulton

Focus Group Members

Carol Ellis
Gregory Battle
Carla Blue
Salimah Muhammad
Rachelle Franklin
Corrine Graham
Melody Jackson
Anne Senatore

Father Eugene Squeo
Jerry Walker
Nidieler Kios
Andrea Johnson
David Sliverstein
John Jayme
Father Robert Skurla
Madeline Santiago
Ramon De La Cruz
Sernon Marquez
Allen Pena
Rev. Luis F. Fernandez, Jr.
Ruben Sosa
Juan Santiago
Police Office Scott McNulty
Police Officer Donald Hess
Police Office Terrence Doran
Police Officer Frank Rivera
Police Officer Frank Rodriguez
Police Officer William Braker, Jr.
Police Officer Brian Davis
Police Lt. Robert Atkinson
Elizabeth Garnes
Darryl Walker
Dawn Odom
Pauline Alua
Sanjay Chauhan
Anna Maria Padilla
Audrey Jackson

Others Observing Focus Group Meetings

Rev. Joseph Jones
Tyrone Townsend
Jasper Walker
Arthur Gibbs
Dr. Pargellen McCall
Robert Romero
Dennis Herron
Crystal Jones
Gary Williams
Yolanda Keahey



RESEARCHERS

On-Site Research Administrator / Neighborhood Liaison

Rosalyn Browne

Neighborhood Residents

Tyrone Townsend
Arthur Gibbs
Jasper Walker
Vernon O'Loughlin
Melvin Freeman
Shane Hilliard
Andrea Johnson
Michael Heller
Leroy Rojas
Derrick Tunia
James Drayton
Kareen Clemons

University Students

Dennis Herron
Jacqueline Castillo
Nnamdi Akwaja
Peter Marcano
Walter Hutchinson
Ongeri Aminga
Daniel Scavette
Annisa Ghoul

Maria Ramos-Pough [data coder]
Stephanie Roth [survey verifier]



NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENT SURVEY - ROUND ONE

1. HAVE YOU, PERSONALLY, BEEN A VICTIM OF A CRIME WHILE LIVING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? ____ YES ____ NO

1A. IF YES, WHAT TYPE OF CRIME?

CRIME INCIDENT #1 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #2 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #3 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #4 _____

1B. IF YES, HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CRIME OCCUR?

CRIME INCIDENT #1 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #2 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #3 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #4 _____

2. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST PRESSING CRIME PROBLEM CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? ____

2A. WHAT SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

2B. WHAT SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR

STEPS SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

3. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE SECOND MOST PRESSING CRIME PROBLEM CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?__

3A. WHAT SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME PROBLEM FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

3B. WHAT SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME PROBLEM FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

4. HAVE YOU, PERSONALLY, EVER HAD ANY FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION WITH A JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICER IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____ YES
_____ NO

4A. IF YES, WHAT TYPE OF CONTACT?

CONTACT INCIDENT #1:

CRIME RELATED? _____ YES _____ NO

DID YOU CONTACT POLICE? _____ YES _____ NO

DID POLICE CONTACT YOU? _____ YES _____ NO

HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CONTACT OCCUR? _____

CONTACT INCIDENT #2:

CRIME RELATED? _____ YES _____ NO

DID YOU CONTACT POLICE? _____ YES _____ NO

DID POLICE CONTACT YOU? _____ YES _____ NO

HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CONTACT OCCUR? _____

CONTACT INCIDENT #3:

CRIME RELATED? _____ YES _____ NO

DID YOU CONTACT POLICE? _____ YES _____ NO

DID POLICE CONTACT YOU? _____ YES _____ NO

HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CONTACT OCCUR? _____

5. ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT _ YES _ NO

5B. IF YES, WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE SERVICE?

5C. IF NO, WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE SERVICE?

6. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES IT PROVIDES TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

7. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT? _____

8. HOW OLD ARE YOU? _____

9. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

10. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND? _____

11. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT OCCUPATION? _____

12. HOW MUCH SCHOOLING HAVE YOU COMPLETED? _____

NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY - ROUND ONE

1. WHILE IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD, HAVE YOU, ONE OF YOUR EMPLOYEES, OR YOUR BUSINESS BEEN A VICTIM OF A CRIME WHILE YOU HAVE OWNED YOUR BUSINESS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____ YES _____ NO

1A. IF YES, WHAT TYPE OF CRIME?

CRIME INCIDENT #1 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #2 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #3 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #4 _____

1B. IF YES, HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CRIME OCCUR?

CRIME INCIDENT #1 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #2 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #3 _____

CRIME INCIDENT #4 _____

2. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST PRESSING CRIME PROBLEM CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

2A. WHAT SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

2B. WHAT SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

3. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE SECOND MOST PRESSING CRIME PROBLEM CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?__

3A. WHAT SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME PROBLEM FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

3B. WHAT SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME PROBLEM FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

4. HAVE YOU, PERSONALLY, EVER HAD ANY FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION WITH A JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICER IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____
YES _____ NO

4A. IF YES, WHAT TYPE OF CONTACT?

CONTACT INCIDENT #1:

CRIME RELATED? _____ YES _____ NO

DID YOU CONTACT POLICE? _____ YES _____ NO

DID POLICE CONTACT YOU? _____ YES _____ NO

HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CONTACT OCCUR? _____

CONTACT INCIDENT #2:

CRIME RELATED? _____ YES _____ NO

DID YOU CONTACT POLICE? _____ YES _____ NO

DID POLICE CONTACT YOU? _____ YES _____ NO

HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CONTACT OCCUR? _____

CONTACT INCIDENT #3:

CRIME RELATED? _____ YES _____ NO

DID YOU CONTACT POLICE? _____ YES _____ NO

DID POLICE CONTACT YOU? _____ YES _____ NO

HOW LONG AGO DID THIS CONTACT OCCUR? _____

5. ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT? _____
YES _____ NO

5B. IF YES, WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE SERVICE? _____

5C. IF NO, WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE SERVICE?

6. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES IT PROVIDES TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

7. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT?

8. HOW OLD ARE YOU? _____

9. HOW LONG HAVE YOU OWNED A BUSINESS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

10. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND? _____

11. WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESS DO YOU OPERATE?

A. SERVICE _____

B. RETAIL _____

C. MANUFACTURING _____

D. OTHER _____

12. HOW MANY PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME PERSONS DOES YOUR BUSINESS CURRENTLY EMPLOY, AT THE LOCATION IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

13. HOW MUCH EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED? _____



JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICER SURVEY - ROUND ONE

1. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST PRESSING CRIME PROBLEM CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

2A. WHAT SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

2B. WHAT SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

2C. WHAT SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

3. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE SECOND MOST PRESSING CRIME PROBLEM CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

3A. WHAT SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD JERSEY CITY POLICE TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO

STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

3B. WHAT SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

3C. WHAT SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO PREVENT THIS SECOND TYPE OF CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS OR STEPS SHOULD BUSINESS OWNERS TAKE TO PREVENT OR TO STOP THIS CRIME FROM HAPPENING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

4. ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT? __ YES __ NO

4A. IF YES, WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT THE SERVICE?

4B. IF NO, WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE SERVICE? _____

5. IN GENERAL, ARE YOU, PERSONALLY, SATISFIED WITH YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
_____ YES _____ NO

5A. IF YES, WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

5B. IF NO, WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

5C. IF YOU ANSWERED YES OR NO, WHAT CAN YOU DO TO IMPROVE YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

5D. IF YOU ANSWERED YES OR NO, WHAT CAN THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO IMPROVE YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS? _____

6. IN GENERAL, ARE YOU, PERSONALLY, SATISFIED WITH YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
_____ YES _____ NO

6A. IF YES, WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

6B. IF NO, WHAT DO YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

6C. IF YOU ANSWERED YES OR NO, WHAT CAN YOU DO TO IMPROVE YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

6D. IF YOU ANSWERED YES OR NO, WHAT CAN THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO TO IMPROVE YOUR WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH BUSINESS OWNERS?

7. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES IT PROVIDES TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? _____

8. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE RESIDENTS OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT?

9. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE STEP SHOULD THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD TAKE, OR WHAT ONE THING SHOULD THE BUSINESS OWNERS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD DO, TO IMPROVE OR TO MAKE BETTER THE SERVICES PROVIDED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE JERSEY CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT?

10. HOW OLD ARE YOU? _____

11. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICER?

12. HOW LONG HAVE YOU PATROLLED THIS NEIGHBORHOOD AS A JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICER? _____

13. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND? _____

14. HOW MUCH EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED? _____



SECOND ROUND SURVEY FOR RESIDENTS, POLICE, BUSINESSES

QUESTION SET # 1 FOR RESIDENTS, BUSINESS OWNERS, AND POLICE:

DURING THE PAST FEW MONTHS, WE HAVE INTERVIEWED OVER 400 PEOPLE LIVING AND WORKING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD. THEY RECOMMENDED OR SUGGESTED DIFFERENT WAYS TO REDUCE OR TO PREVENT CRIME IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD.

OF THE BELOW NOTED 15 DIFFERENT RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS MADE BY PEOPLE LIVING OR WORKING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD, WHICH IS YOUR FIRST CHOICE FOR REDUCING OR PREVENTING CRIME IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? I WILL MARK THIS CHOICE #1. WHICH IS YOUR SECOND CHOICE? I WILL MARK THIS CHOICE #2. AND WHICH IS YOUR THIRD CHOICE? I WILL MARK THIS CHOICE #3. YOU ONLY GET THREE CHOICES.

STRATEGY CHOICE #1 CHOICE #2 CHOICE #3

1. ESTABLISH NEIGHBORHOOD BLOCK WATCH PROGRAM
2. INCREASE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ABOUT CRIME PROBLEMS AND POLICE OPERATIONS BETWEEN OR AMONG POLICE, RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS OWNERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD
3. INCREASE POLICE PRESENCE AND VISIBILITY IN NEIGHBORHOOD
4. REQUIRE RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS OWNERS TO TAKE BETTER CARE OF THEIR PROPERTY TO MAKE THE NEIGHBORHOOD LOOK BETTER

5. INCREASE SPEED WITH WHICH POLICE RESPOND TO RESIDENTS' AND BUSINESS OWNERS' COMPLAINTS ABOUT CRIME PROBLEMS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD
6. PROVIDE MORE TRAINING TO POLICE OFFICERS
7. REQUIRE PARENTS TO BETTER SUPERVISE THEIR CHILDREN
8. HIRE MORE POLICE OFFICERS
9. GIVE POLICE OFFICERS MORE DISCRETION OR CHOICES AS THEY DO THEIR JOB
10. INCREASE ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS BY HAVING POLICE MAKE MORE ARRESTS AND ISSUE MORE TICKETS FOR LAW VIOLATIONS
11. ENCOURAGE RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS OWNERS TO COOPERATE WITH EFFORTS TO PROSECUTE ALLEGED OFFENDERS AFTER AN ARREST IS MADE
12. INCREASE THE TYPE AND AMOUNT OF SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT IN NEIGHBORHOOD [FOR EXAMPLE, INSTALL MORE ALARMS AND CAMERAS]
13. INCREASE THE TYPE AND AMOUNT OF AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH
14. INCREASE NUMBER OF NON-WHITE POLICE OFFICERS PATROLLING NEIGHBORHOOD
15. INCREASE LIGHTING IN NEIGHBORHOOD

QUESTION SET # 2 FOR RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS OWNERS:

IN RESPONSE TO THE ABOVE NOTED QUESTION, YOU SELECTED THREE WAYS IN WHICH CRIME CAN BE REDUCED OR PREVENTED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD.

WHAT ARE YOU WILLING TO DO TO MAKE CERTAIN CRIME CAN BE REDUCED OR PREVENTED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

ARE YOU WILLING TO SPEND SOME OF YOUR TIME TO HELP THE NEIGHBORHOOD REDUCE OR PREVENT CRIME

16. YES _____ NO _____

17. IF YES, HOW MUCH TIME? LESS THAN ONE HOUR PER MONTH _____ 1 TO 5 HOURS PER MONTH _____ MORE THAN 5 HOURS PER MONTH _____

18. IF YES, OF THE THREE CHOICES YOU SELECTED ABOVE, IN WHICH ONE ACTIVITY ARE YOU WILLING TO INVEST YOUR TIME?

SELECT ONLY ONE. CHOICE #1 _____ CHOICE #2 _____ CHOICE #3 _____

ARE YOU WILLING TO SPEND SOME OF YOUR MONEY TO HELP FUND OR FINANCE A PROGRAM TO HELP THE NEIGHBORHOOD REDUCE OR PREVENT CRIME

19. YES _____ NO _____

20. IF YES, HOW MUCH MONEY? LESS THAN \$1 PER MONTH _____ \$1 TO \$5 PER MONTH _____ MORE THAN \$5 PER MONTH _____

21. IF YES, OF THE THREE CHOICES YOU SELECTED ABOVE, IN WHICH ONE ACTIVITY ARE YOU WILLING TO INVEST YOUR MONEY?

SELECT ONLY ONE. CHOICE #1 _____ CHOICE #2 _____ CHOICE #3 _____

QUESTION SET # 3: SOME FOR RESIDENTS, SOME FOR BUSINESSES, SOME FOR POLICE:

I HAVE JUST A FEW ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS TO ASK YOU SO THAT WE CAN COMPARE RESPONSES BASED ON SURVEY RESPONDENTS' BACKGROUNDS:

RESIDENTS/ BUSINESS OWNERS/ POLICE

22. HOW OLD ARE YOU? 18 TO 25 _____ 26 TO 35 _____ 36 TO 45 _____ 46 TO 60 _____ OVER 60 _____

23. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? LESS THAN 5 YEARS _____ 5 TO 10 YEARS _____ 11 TO 20 YEARS _____ OVER 20 YEARS _____ XXX
XXX

24. HOW LONG HAVE YOU OWNED A BUSINESS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? XXX
LESS THAN 5 YEARS _____ 5 TO 10 YEARS _____ 11 TO 20 YEARS _____ OVER 20 YEARS _____ XXX

25. HOW LONG HAVE YOU PATROLLED THE LAFAYETTE/MORRIS CANAL NEIGHBORHOOD? XXX XXX
LESS THAN 5 YEARS _____ 5 TO 10 YEARS _____ 11 TO 20 YEARS _____ OVER 20 YEARS _____

26. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND? AFRICAN
DESCENT ___ HISPANIC DESCENT ___ EUROPEAN DESCENT ___ ARAB DESCENT
___ ASIAN DESCENT ___ OTHER _____

27. DO YOU OWN OR RENT YOUR HOME? OWN _____ RENT _____ XXX
XXX

28. DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF 18 LIVING WITH YOU? YES
_____ NO _____ XXX XXX

29. WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESS DO YOU OPERATE? XXX
RETAIL _____ SERVICE _____ MANUFACTURING ___ OTHER _____
XXX

30. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICER? XXX XXX
LESS THAN 5 YEARS ___ 5 TO 10 YEARS _____ 11 TO 20 YEARS ___ OVER 20
YEARS _____

31. HOW MUCH EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED? NO HIGH SCHOOL
___ HIGH SCHOOL/GED ___ SOME COLLEGE _____ COLLEGE GRAD _____

32. HAVE YOU OR A FAMILY MEMBER BEEN A VICTIM OF A CRIME WHILE IN
THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? YES _____ NO _____ YES _____ NO _____ XXX

33. IF YES TO QUESTION #32 ABOVE, HOW LONG AGO DID THE LAST CRIME
INCIDENT OCCUR? LESS THAN 6 MONTHS AGO ___ 6 MONTHS TO 1 YEAR AGO
_____ OVER 1 YEAR AGO

34. IF YES TO QUESTION #32 ABOVE, WHAT TYPE OF CRIME WAS THE LAST
CRIME INCIDENT YOU OR YOUR FAMILY MEMBER EXPERIENCED? AGAINST
PROPERTY [LIKE BREAKING INTO YOUR HOME OR OTHER THEFT OR
VANDALISM] _____ AGAINST PERSON [LIKE ASSAULT OR ROBBERY]



About The Author

This report was prepared by Anne T. Sulton, Ph.D., J.D. Anne served as an associate professor of criminal justice, at New Jersey City University, from 2000 to 2004. Anne currently practices law.

Anne received a doctorate degree in criminology and criminal justice from the University of Maryland-College Park and a law degree from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Anne is licensed to practice law in Wisconsin and Colorado, before state and federal trial and appellate courts.

Anne has been involved in community-based crime prevention work since the mid-1970s. In 1978, she left her faculty position at Spelman College in Atlanta to serve as the first research associate for the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE) in their Baltimore office. Anne also worked as a lead consultant for the National Crime Prevention Institute, which helped introduce the Neighborhood Block Watch program. Following her crime prevention technical assistance research work with NOBLE, Anne joined the faculty at Howard University. While there, she wrote her doctoral dissertation on community crime prevention. In 1985, Anne began working for the Police Foundation in Washington, DC, directing its Inner-City Crime Control project. In 1990, the Police Foundation published the results of this work as a book. Anne has authored several published articles on inner-city crime control, economic development of inner-city neighborhoods to prevent crime, prevention of racially-motivated hate crimes, and preventing school violence. During the past 25 years, she has lectured extensively on crime prevention issues across the United States, from Alaska to Florida.

Anne is included in Who's Who in America, Who's Who Among African Americans, and Who's Who in American Law. She has received numerous awards, including service awards from the Denver NAACP and Colorado-Montana-Wyoming NAACP State Conference for her work as a civil rights trial lawyer. Anne also received Atlanta's First Black Certificated Aviatrix Award for becoming, in 1977, the first African American female in Atlanta to receive a pilot's license.

For additional information on this report, please contact Dr. Sulton at:

annesulton@comcast.net