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ABSTRACT

Crime is one of the most serious problems confronting residents of public housing. Although the impact of crime is nationwide, it places a special burden on public housing residents, a population already burdened by low income and difficult living conditions. Typical crime prevention activities have taken a wide variety of forms including citizen patrols, private guard services, property identification campaigns, programs to make residents more aware of good crime prevention practices, and an increased use of security devices.

The major facet of the security problem in public housing is the tenants' sense that they have not received adequate police protection as compared to other residents of the city. The two case studies presented here represent local security measures used by the tenants of the Boston Public Housing Authority. These studies provide a basis for judging the effectiveness of community service programs.

Finally, the paper makes recommendations as to whether or not there should be permanent governmental support of patrol activities.

Thesis Supervisor: Aaron Fleisher, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, MIT.
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CHAPTER I

THE TYPES OF SECURITY IN BOSTON PUBLIC HOUSING

In order to construct a basis for the study of security in Boston Public Housing, we will begin by examining the historical perspective of tenant organizations and their role in establishing protective services in the Boston Housing Authority (BHA) developments. Secondly, there will be a history of police protection of the projects. Thirdly, there follows a description of the types of security patrols that are already existing in the BHA and the types of services they can provide. Finally, there is an overview of projects which have been selected for case studies and of the reasons why they were selected.

In 1969, the National Tenants Organization (NTO) was launched, a product of the efforts of more than sixty affiliated tenant groups, to improve living conditions in public housing projects. Its entrance upon the national scene was fostered by two natural allies: the Black liberationists and the anti-poverty crusades of the Kennedy and Johnson eras.

These projects' financial and social problems alone gave these allies something to sink their teeth into, with "minority representation" and "tenant participation" as their watch words. Initially, efforts focused on shaking up the public housing establishment. Tenants were elected or appointed to housing authorities. Public housing tenants' councils were
organized and sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity action agencies. Congress wrote tenant participation in planning into the modernization program, and the spirit of tenants' rights was voiced in the bleak, prisonlike walls of one project after another.

The American public has witnessed a variety of governmental strategies for improving the quality of low-income housing: urban renewal, urban rehabilitation and, more recently, "model cities." The failure of most of these programs to bring lasting benefits to their recipients probably reflects their mistaken assumption that improved housing, in itself, can eradicate many of the problems associated with poverty. Yet alcoholism, drug addiction, high rates of illegitimacy, unemployment, broken homes, crime, and delinquency have not yielded to the planners' programs in public housing projects. Rather than breaking up slum housing, they have, all too frequently, become more visible slums. Moreover, these projects have often been regarded as "dumping grounds" for the "have-nots" of society, so that even the poor themselves often find them undesirable.

A new interest in the problems and possibilities of public housing has emerged with the advent of "War on Crime" during the Johnson administration. As public housing tenants have become more vocal in their claims that the poor are too often the victims of crime, efforts to control crime and delinquency have, to some degree, been directed toward project dwellers.
The highest crime rate areas in the City of Boston are public housing developments.¹ In some developments, tenants have stated that cutting down crime is a greater concern than improving physical living conditions because, as intolerable as physical decay may be, fear of crime as well as being victimized by crime is making life there insupportable. Fear of violence in the hallways and on the streets within and around their developments virtually imprison many elderly residents in their apartments.

The high incidence of crime in BHA housing is bleakly documented. Obviously, the actual incidence of crime may be much higher than recorded due to the fact that many crimes remain unreported. Fear of retaliation by the criminals, coupled with the experience of the inability of the police to arrest, hold, and see the perpetrator brought to justice, is a likely cause for the high rate of unreported crime.

Security problems in these multi-story housing developments are peculiar to public housing in large municipalities. The police, traditionally expected to maintain security there, are trained to work in the street, in and around developments. Policing high-rise housing projects is quite different from policing homes. These high-rise developments offer an offender both anonymity and a wide range of temptations at

which he can grasp without ever appearing on the street. He seldom crosses the police's routine domain.

This unfortunate and dangerous situation is caused by logistical considerations. Since the Boston Police Department (BPD) depends on motor vehicles for patrol, its operations are limited in housing developments. Many developments are located within grounds that are inaccessible to peripheral areas. Local police districts have done little to create alternate patrolling methods which would adequately respond to public housing security problems.

This leads to a second and more serious cause of the lack of effective patrols in housing developments—police-community tension. In several developments, police-community interactions have become so strained that tenants avoid police assistance when required and needed, while the police help only grudgingly, disrespectfully, or not at all. (See Bromley-Heath Case Study.)

Crimes in housing development are of almost every type, including the sale of "hot goods" and illegal drugs. Dumping of stolen property on BHA grounds is reaching epidemic proportions.

A. BHA Central Security Department

There are the BHA developments of Archdale, Washington-

\[\text{Annual Report 1973-1974 (Boston, Massachusetts: Boston Housing Authority), p. 10.}\]
Beech, Commonwealth, Cathedral in the South End, and Columbia Point, all located in high crime areas, where problems have become overwhelming. As a result, in 1969, the BHA Administrator and the BPD Commissioner agreed to create a BHA Central Security Department whose purpose was to plan and implement BHA operated security programs and service. This department has a staff of five—the director, two security coordinators, a secretary, and the operator of a short-wave radio system, linking various BHA offices and personnel in the field—and is located in the management building at Columbia Point project.

This department is one division in the BHA which is headed by an employee of another city department. For the past seven years, it has been directed by Officer Leo Gulinello of BPD whose salary is shared by BHA funds. In theory, such an arrangement was designed to bridge the gap between two public agencies accustomed to deal with very different kinds of problems. In practice, however, this arrangement has several drawbacks. Because the security department head is a Police Officer, he is technically a BPD employee. On the other hand, he is also assigned full-time to BHA; yet, as a Police Officer, he is not formally part of the lines of authority in BHA.

BHA Security Department has the following functions:
1. Overall administration of paid security guards;
2. Overall administration of paid police details;
3. Assistance to resident security patrols;
4. Assistance to development managers and other BHA staff with security problems;

1. **Overall Administration of Paid Security Guards**

A large share of the BHA budget allocated to security is used to hire private guard services for elderly housing developments and Cathedral, predominantly housing families. These services usually translate into one man in uniform who sits in the lobby of an elderly building. His duties are to screen visitors to prevent unauthorized individuals from entering the building, to keep the outside door locked, and, in general, to supervise who comes and goes. In most places, guards have a telephone so they can summon the police or emergency services such as an ambulance. The guard's presence is also intended to deter vandalism. For many elderly residents, it also provides a sense of being protected which combats their fear of crime, both real and perceived. Because perceived crime can make people feel as threatened as actual crime, the simple physical presence of someone at the main entrance gives a feeling of security to many tenants. In fact, many people move into elderly housing largely because of the greater security they believe it offers compared to private homes.

2. **Overall Administration of Paid Police Details**

The second largest expenditure in BHA's security
budget goes to hire off-duty policemen who, in paid details, patrol family developments. Since they are trained policemen, it is expected that they could deal directly with incidents of crime, more so than private guards who lack official police powers. Unlike private security guards, who sit in lobbies and may walk through buildings, paid police details are supposed to provide horizontal patrols; that is, they are supposed to patrol among buildings.

3. **Assistance to Resident Security Patrols**

The BHA Central Security Department has designed a system of resident security patrols for several BHA family developments. This program is the department's major effort to involve tenants in security services. The concept behind these patrols is that the authority will provide locked exterior doors in individual buildings, and tenants in each entryway will organize to keep the doors locked and, if necessary, to patrol the hallways. Since few of BHA's family developments have door bells, intercoms or buzzer-systems, keeping exterior doors locked requires that tenants take the initiative to open and close the doors for both residents and guests who do not have keys to the doors. Another element in this program is that the tenants in each building are supposed to decide at what hours the door to their building will be kept locked.
4. Assistance to Development Managers and Other BHA Staff With Security Problems

The security department is available to deal with specific, security-related problems at the request of development managers and other staff. From time to time, a manager has asked them to help in serving an eviction notice on a tenant when the manager anticipated trouble from the tenant.

The security department is also called upon by other BHA staff to help handle emergency situations such as major fires and utility service breakdowns. According to the director, the office also looks into serious crime which occurs on BHA property, although formal investigations are conducted by the Boston Police Department.

Finally, the security office has been requested by the BHA Administrator to investigate each internal security problem as suspected theft of BHA property or inappropriate employee behavior.

5. Monitoring Boston Police Department Crime Statistics

The statistics which BPD collects on crime are compiled for each public housing development in the city. Another major facet of the security problem in public housing is the tenants' claim of receiving inadequate protection from BPD compared to other areas in Boston.

Police coverage is essential to decrease crime and vandalism since no agency or resident program can provide the clout and protection police departments can. Until 1970,
however, the BPD had no official commitment to the BHA other than its regular patrolling of the districts. After numerous meetings with tenant task forces, the citywide TPC, Elderly Task Force, and the TPC board, the BHA Administrator and the Police Commissioner established the Boston Housing Unit. Founded in 1970, the unit was responsible for patrolling the twelve highest crime-rate family developments. Composed of seventy men, patrolling these areas on a rotating basis, the unit members were not assigned directly to the projects but to the particular districts in which the developments were located. They were also responsible for calls outside the project area. In 1976, the unit was abolished because of its unresponsiveness and poorly qualified officers.

Not only were the unit's own operations much criticized by tenants and BHA alike, but tenants in the developments reported that they were often unable to get any response from their local district police stations because the stations claimed that public housing was entirely the unit's responsibility. If the unit's members were unavailable, tenants felt they lacked police protection entirely. The poor performance of the unit was shown up during the fall of 1975 when its members were temporarily replaced by BPD rookies, while its officers were assigned to special busing details. With the rookies, many tenants, for the first time, saw police patrolling actively through their buildings.

During the winter of 1976, the BPD made another
commitment to security in Boston public housing by instituting team policing for the five highest crime-rate family developments. They are operating in (1) Columbia Point, (2) Mission Hill Main and Mission Extension, (3) West Broadway, (4) Franklin Hill and Franklin Field, and (5) Bromley and Heath Streets.

The team policing operation is as follows: each development, or pair of developments, is the responsibility of one team, consisting of twelve patrolmen plus one sergeant who is in charge of organizing and supervising the team. Each team operates out of the district station where the development is located and is under the overall command of the district captain. The teams cover their developments for two shifts per day, from eight AM to one AM. When the team is off duty from one to eight AM, coverage is provided by the local district station. In his original announcement of the program, former Police Commissioner Robert DiGrazia said that team members were not supposed to be pulled out of the developments for other assignments, thereby assuring that the developments would be fully covered at all times.

B. Security Funding Sources

Aside from BHA and BPD funded security programs, there are yet other funding sources and programs in the BHA developments. The Federal Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act has become a major funding source for such
programs. In addition, community-based security programs are operating in six family developments with funds from the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), administered by the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice. Programs vary from the paid uniformed patrol in Bromley-Heath to the programs at Cathedral and West Broadway projects where they are primarily advocacy and community organizing services. ³

CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

Chapter I has provided an account of the national movement towards tenant participation and BHA's attempt to respond to that need. The next area of particular focus was crime prevention methods used by BHA. This had been one of the more pressing concerns of the tenants. These activities were examined in detail from city level administered programs. In the following chapters, the author will look at local security measures used by tenants of the BHA, their funded and non-funded attempts to fight crime in their developments. The study examines two housing projects in depth: (1) Cathedral in the South End which has an on-going security program and (2) Bromley-Heath Street's security patrol. The case studies are intended to emphasize this study's major objective: to increase awareness of the importance and nature of residential security problems and to stimulate initiative at the local level.

Public housing security is ordinarily defined in terms of project boundaries. However, in the aforementioned projects, this delimitation is not always considered valid in the eyes of management and tenants. Some offenses within the projects are not viewed as security problems, while others, beyond the projects' boundaries, are considered residential in nature. Security focuses on "stranger" crimes (i.e., where victim and offender are strangers), with less emphasis on crimes among
acquaintances or members of the same family, even if committed within project boundaries. The so-called "victimless" offenses (drunkenness, drug abuse, prostitution), minor disturbances of the peace, and infractions of certain project rules are treated as security problems, while crimes on adjacent or nearby streets were seen as so closely associated with the residential environment as to merit treatment as security problems of the project itself.⁴

In the minds of resident management staff, guests, tradesmen, public service personnel, and others who have reason to be concerned about crime and vandalism in housing projects, the word "security" has evoked different reactions regarding real and obvious risks of crime and vandalism in certain areas. It also brought to mind the subjective concern relating to the probability of crime and vandalism in areas where there is no actual known risk. For example, residents may harbor extreme fears, particularly of violent crimes, even though the actual danger is remote. On the other hand, they may feel tolerably secure in the face of a high degree of imminent danger. The fear has constituted a security problem because the feelings of insecurity have created deep anxieties which impair the individual's ability to cope with the overall physical, social, and economic problems.

of day-to-day life.

My research was begun by arranging personal interviews with the group leaders to discuss security organization, operation, and administration. I found that, when setting out to accumulate patrol information, it was advantageous to contact the patrol coordinator first. He could usually provide a comprehensive outline of patrol activities which included a historical account of the patrol's start-up as well as results of past and present patrol efforts.

Following the initial discussion with the group coordinator, several participants in the patrol or guard activity were interviewed. Actual interviews were conducted both in person and by telephone. Some of the questions asked concerned motives for participation, training time commitment, and individual perceptions of patrol effectiveness (see Questionnaire, Appendix #11).

I also conducted discussions with the president and vice-president of the Tenants' Council to determine the kinds of activities in which building residents participate as well as the frequency with which they join. Aside from these primary field sources, I consulted additional informants for background material pertaining to the tenants' efforts at the two sites.

From a case study approach, I have surveyed the overall problem of security at the Bromley-Heath and Cathedral projects with a special focus on permanent police service/crime prevention, protective service programs.
A. Types of Security Action

Where security problems are serious, as in the afore-mentioned projects, a comprehensive attack on crime and vandalism required three types of action:

1. **Check.** Directly deter or control the problem (e.g., prevent illegal access by hardware or policing).

2. **Treat.** Address the surface causes of the problem (e.g., divert youthful energies from vandalism to wholesome recreation).

3. **Cure.** Attack the root causes of the problem (e.g., provide economic and educational opportunities).

B. Applying Security Action

This paper examines the crime prevention categories in the Boston public housing projects. However, another study, performed by Yin on behalf of the Rand Corporation, explores both public housing and non-public housing security patrols, and its findings have universal application. The following is quoted directly from the Yin report:

There are four criteria for defining a resident patrol. To qualify as such, a patrol must: (1) follow a specified patrol or surveillance routine; (2) function mainly to prevent criminal acts or apprehend criminals; (3) operate under the control of a group of citizens; and (4) concern itself primarily with safety in residential areas as opposed to commercial areas.⁵

To evaluate the patrol's performance, it is necessary to partition the patrol into a few analytically useful groups. Such grouping helps to develop generalizations about the various patrol efforts and to facilitate the application of the appropriate evaluative criteria to each, according to Yin's study.

C. Patrol Typology

Yin states that useful foundations on which to develop a typology appear to be the various types of patrol activities: (a) watching electronically controlled surveillance equipment or observing police activities; (b) the type of space being patrolled; (c) the kinds of activities the patrol is involved in other than crime prevention. The types chosen for this study are taken from the various kinds of patrols in the BHA. The names for the patrols, according to Yin's descriptions, are: (1) Community Protection; (2) Building Patrol; (3) Neighborhood Patrol; (4) Social Service Patrol.

1. Community Patrol

This patrol activity is usually done after some degree of police brutality has been claimed by a number of residents. They feel as though the police are using unnecessary force or harassment in the neighborhood. The patrol duties are generally to monitor police activity in their neighborhood and service as witnesses for the victims of such incidents.
2. **Building Patrol**

   This activity is done by stationary guards or foot patrols. Their responsibility is to watch the building or group of buildings for unlawful actions. This is done both inside and outside of the buildings. There also is monitoring of who enters and leaves the particular buildings.

3. **Neighborhood Patrol**

   This is done on foot or in automobiles. It carries the patrol's duties onto the police turf because of the large area it covers in the community. It varies from one block to a whole tract area, protecting the neighborhood from criminal acts.

4. **Social Service Patrol**

   This type of patrol is generally an educational activity. They work from building to building, and an entire neighborhood, if necessary. Their function is to more or less educate the residents about measures to prevent crime (i.e., self-defense, engraving programs, escort services, etc.).
III. CASE STUDIES

A. Bromley-Heath Project

The Bromley-Heath Housing Project is comprised of two low-rent housing projects that have been erected within a seven-acre section of Boston called Jamaica Plain.

The project itself contains some seventeen three-story buildings which were established during World War II for the families of servicemen. In the 1950s, Bromley Park was built, and this includes six three-story and ten seven-story structures. According to a study by Marx and Archer, seventy percent of the project's 4,500 residents are under the age of 21.6 The greatest percentage of the residents are black; however, there are also a few elderly white and Spanish-speaking residents.

The community itself is essentially well-organized. There is an extremely socially-aware group of citizens' organizations which originated in 1972 to form the Tenant-Management Corporation (TMC).

The TMC's responsibilities included taking over the maintenance of some of the buildings which serve as showcases for the TMC. Later, the corporation assumed control of the formerly BHA-administered Bromley-Heath housing developments.

---

Catering to low-income residents, Bromley-Heath is a deteriorating, overpopulated project with a building layout highly conducive to criminal activity. It can be understood that, in such a climate, the residents must live in constant fear, and this has been further complicated and irritated by a deterioration of police-community interface. However, in the late 1960s, a volunteer security patrol was formed at the urging of the community.

Beginning with the violent period following the assassination of Martin Luther King, the patrol served not to prevent crime but to police disorderly youth and make it unnecessary for the police to come into the project.

It worked. Women ran the patrol in the daytime, while the men worked. After hours and on the weekends, the men assumed the responsibility. The goals of the activity were two-fold in nature: to gain some control over acts of criminal behavior—vandalism, destruction, arson—and to monitor police activities within and near the project in order to avoid any incidence of physical violence.

The volunteer activity of this patrol was supported by the residents of Bromley-Heath to a great extent. Males and females patrolled the project, wearing white armbands. Volunteers on duty weekends patrolled all night.

The nature of their work began to expand. Volunteers began to identify and give warnings of local troublemakers, thus reducing the amount of stolen cars, destruction of
property, and so forth.

Probably as a consequence of the general success of the program, other volunteer programs began to go into effect around Boston. At the same time, the Mayor's office sought to legitimize them, while gaining some measure of control. Limited funding was made available. Registration with the BPD and Human Rights Office was required at a later point.

The Bromley-Heath group turned down an offer of some $300 for equipment, feeling that funding would diminish the volunteer incentive that was really the main-spring to the entire program.

Apparently, the incentive had already begun to prove ineffective. Cole, Bromley-Heath Security Patrol Director, cites incidents of volunteers hanging around the Area Planning Action Council (APAC) office rather than patrolling the street. At one point, four additional night guards, armed with baton and mace, were contracted by BHA to assist the patrol. These men, working for a private security agency, were initially assigned at the ratio of one guard to two volunteers. The private agency disputed this arrangement and reneged on the contract. According to Cole, the guards' lack of training soon posed a potential threat both to themselves and the project residents. Their lack of rapport with the volunteers precipitated their removal.  

Marx and Archer, p. 48.
Messrs. Walter Jabzanka and Richard Kelleher, along with the Mayor's Safe Streets Committee, played a significant role in the program's continuance. They distributed resources to community groups, listed program alternatives, and, in many ways, served as catalysts.

In late 1970, they aided in the formation of a task force whose membership included BHA, the BPD's Housing Unit, and active Bromley-Heath residents. The group explored the possibility of using recently granted LEAA funding to improve public housing security.

The conclusion reached by the committee listed the following three options for providing security at Bromley-Heath: a special patrol of BPD police officers, a combined patrol force of volunteers, or, finally, a combination of police and paid security guards.

It was understood that a Task Force that used resident patrolmen should not be subjected to reprisals and added suspicion by giving the patrolmen weapons and the power of arrest. The patrolmen employed in this manner would be called "community workers," and their task would be essentially to supply a visible presence within the community.

During the first six months of 1971, the local APAC held hearings with residents, the Mayor's committee, the BHA, the BPD, and the Patrolmen's Association to discuss funding.

Community groups began to see the APAC's need for some kind of grant, leading to the development of a plan by
John Fiske, legal counsel for the City of Boston and Chairman of the Safe Streets Committee, agreeable to both community agencies and the police.

The plan, which took over a year to finalize, was unique and distinct from most of the state's other Community Service Officer (CSO) programs.

In its final form, it called for a paid community patrol to be supervised by a monitoring committee. Its primary goals were:

1. to create better community relations within Bromley-Heath;
2. to curtail crime and vandalism within the project;
3. to provide firefighting support and assist in fire prevention;
4. to offer medical assistance;
5. to improve police-community cooperation.

1. Recruitment, Training, and Deployment
   a. Recruitment

   A leaflet was distributed to all apartment in Bromley-Heath, announcing the formation of the paid patrol and recruiting patrol members. Initially, the patrol only employed residents from Bromley-Heath and the immediate neighborhood. By 1976, however, the high number of program applicants from the project with police records forced the hiring of applicants on a citywide basis.
Although the contract permits the hiring of 18-year old guards, most patrolmen are between twenty and thirty years old. There is no maximum age. Early in the patrol's history, a woman was hired as part of the paid patrol, but when the schedule created time conflicts, she became a part-time dispatcher.

b. Training

At first, the six-week training program consisted of six-hour days--four hours in the office, and two hours in the street. Self-defense (a combination of karate, judo, and aikido) constituted a large part of the training. Officer Lamb, the instructor from the Boston Police Academy, is a Fourth Dan Black Belt in Doju Ru Karate. He currently teaches two hours per week. The program emphasis throughout has been one of self-defense methods for resisting an attacker. The majority of patrolmen hold advanced belts in karate.

The other training focus has been on law enforcement strategies and methods, primarily taught by National Guard Officers. Police personnel also volunteered their services in training patrol members. A community relations officer from BPD, District 2, Lt. Cohen, lectured on patrolmen's responsibilities and the police manual. In addition, he outlined the "citizen's arrest" procedure for dealing with felons.

A knowledge of first aid is a requirement for patrol
member. Wardell Loatman, a Red Cross Instructor, trains all program personnel, after which follows a ninety-day trial period. During the trial period, each patrolman must pass a test in standard First Aid procedures. Apparently, the quality of the training has been maintained at its serious level. Because training is an on-going process, it seems to be a positive factor in motivating the men to keep up their skills and maintain a professional attitude.

c. Deployment

The new patrol began its actual service late in June 1972. In terms of the organization of the Bromley-Heath Community Patrol, the overall design is fairly interesting. The patrol is manned by twenty-one employees, including twelve patrolmen, three field supervisors, a director, an assistant director, a secretary, and two dispatchers as well as a part-time bookkeeper. The patrol itself consists entirely of males, largely in their mid-twenties. Most do not have second jobs; several go to school.

Operating on a six-day week, the patrol is divided into two daily shifts. Six teams of two men each are assigned duties on a week-to-week basis. Weekdays, the shift usually consists of three teams and a field supervisor, with the shift from 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM. The director and secretary work from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM daily because most of their dealings are with other agencies that are open during the day. The assistant director works various shifts, while the
full-time dispatcher is on duty from 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM, and the part-time dispatcher works the evening shift. The nature of the daily patrol is very significant. Each morning, the entire project undergoes a thorough security check. According to Marx and Archer, the teams "turn doorknobs," inspect hallways, roofs, and entrances. Since most of the elevators are inoperative, the men walk up one side of the building and down the other side.

Vacant apartments present a special problem to security patrols as they are used as hiding places for drug abuse, delinquent children, and a storage for stolen goods. Roofs present a similar problem. In fact, patrolmen cite many instances of discovering stolen handbags and debris left by drug addicts in these places.

The morning check normally takes one-half hour. After this, the teams divide, and one is assigned to guard school children crossing an intersection, while the other begins a roving random patrol during which they are on the lookout for such things as suspicious gatherings, children skipping school, physical hazards on the ground, and so forth. During the daytime, the patrol keeps a constant eye on Bromley-Heath, while simultaneously standing ready to answer the dispatcher's call. Next, the guards patrol street crossings near the neighborhood school. Later in the afternoon, the patrol once again watches the intersection, so that senior citizens will be able to cross without difficulty.
In the evening, the patrol duties are more varied because of reduced manpower and less activity in open areas around the development. The team's patrol cars provide greater mobility, while additionally making their whereabouts less predictable. Special attention is given to the project offices and social service facilities after they have closed for the night. Mobile communications are a very important part of the program of the patrol at Bromley-Heath. The dispatchers are the center of the operation, and nearly all patrol activities are reported to the office by radio. Written reports are actually excerpted from the dispatcher's log. A coding system, based on the police dispatchers' codes, is used to facilitate messages between the dispatcher and the field. There is a "hot-line" established as a direct telephone between the patrol and the police in the event of an emergency, a direct result of a request by the monitoring committee and the Mayor's Safe Streets Committee to the Chief of Police.

The patrol's organization itself is rather formal and reflects the leaders' military backgrounds. Without doubt, this adds to the effectiveness of the program from different points of view: One is the obvious fact that people working under this type of discipline respond to it by either taking pride in it or rejecting it entirely, and those who reject it do not stay. Those who accept it begin to understand that the patrol is one part of a communications network
that must operate as a tight unit. If the members of the organization were to work on their own and not as part of the entire unit, they would be useless to the entire enterprise. The age range of the men and women in the patrol is between twenty and thirty-five which can be considered relatively young. In working with a young and inexperienced staff, because most of the patrol has had no prior experience, the military routine obviously contributes to efficiency and discipline. Unfortunately, this approach is not always conducive to good tenant-patrol relations as well as adding a degree of bureaucracy into the process.

2. Outlook

Obviously, the program is imperfect. To begin with, the program has suffered from the changes in administration, caused by three different directors in its first fifteen months of operation. The first two directors apparently had found administration difficult. One observer cited the first director's problems with supervision and administration, a lack perceived by the tenants. The second in command who was often delegated full authority was not seen as a strong leader, and his decisions were often unpopular with the men.8

Of the people who have resigned from the program since its inception, one left for a better job with TMC; one had family problems; another person left for health reasons; 

---

8 Marx and Archer, p. 15.
another one gave no reason for leaving. Two men have been fired. According to Walter Norris, second Director of the Patrol, one was frequently either late or absent from duty, and a second one was fired after he was found drunk on the job. It seems, though, that these men have not caused any trouble for the patrol since they were dismissed.

There are varied opinions as to what makes a good CSO. The following comments were made by three of the patrol's previous directors:

Milton Cole:

The men's average age is late twenties. Some live in Bromley-Heath, and some live out. The feeling is that one of the best workers is a Puerto Rican who lives across the street. Wardell Loatman lives out, and he was one of the best in the first group. It really depends on the guy and his commitment to decreasing crime.

Walter Norris:

The men who were fired knew the job wasn't hard, but because they lived here, felt they could get away with certain things. I knew a lot of the games the guys had, and I don't know if someone from outside would be better. The outside guys meet people from inside and lay out too. Outsiders might make better patrolmen, but the tenants would cry prejudice.

Emil Harris:

We need someone with a background in public relations; military service is good for being on the patrol. The people who have worked out the best seem to be veterans. They are the guys who take the ball and do the job--service seems to mature a young man.

Although the Bronley-Heath Patrol has no specific hiring requirements, the tendency has been to hire blacks and Puerto Ricans in their mid-twenties from the project or
its immediate surrounding area. As mentioned earlier, the program has recently begun to hire men from outside Jamaica Plain. It is too early to tell how these patrolmen will perform.

3. **Summary and Conclusion**

This case study was an attempt to analyze the Bromley-Heath Community Patrol. The patrol is a community project. It was started by neighborhood residents in response to concerns expressed at a community meeting. Members of the patrol are residents of Bromley-Heath and the nearby areas. They are not vigilantes. They do not carry weapons nor are they expected to stop violent crimes. Their job is to maintain the security of the buildings, handle misdemeanors, and minor complaints, provide first aid, and refer serious matters to the police. The patrol is posted in two-man teams, and they walk irregular beats through the community. There are six men on patrol continually between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM. They have been given training in unarmed self-defense and First Aid. The patrol has been very efficient at day-to-day operations but less effective at handling grant management affairs.

The main objective of the patrol has always been to reduce the incidence of crime in the Bromley-Heath housing project. In order to accomplish this, there are many secondary goals which must be reached: (1) to encourage residents to report suspicious behavior to the authorities; (2) to initiate and promote better relationships between the community
and the BPD; (3) to provide visible patrol services during the day and early evening hours to the residents; (4) to improve the security of dwellings in order to make crimes more difficult; and (5) to handle many of the mundane and time-consuming tasks that overburden the police.

It is impossible to accurately evaluate the main objective of the patrol because of the inaccuracy of crime statistics. This is due to the fact that many crimes are not reported, and there is no way to measure the discrepancy between what is reported and what actually took place. Furthermore, the secondary goal of encouraging residents to report suspicious happenings has not been reached, and one must look at police crime statistics with reservations.

The statistics shown in Appendix #2 are the police crime statistics for Bromley-Heath, and they represent ten areas in which the patrol should make an impact. In all but two areas, purse snatching and assault and battery, the crime statistics show a reduction in the incidence of crime and leave one with the impression that the patrol has been effective. The effect of the patrol is evident when one examines the category of breaking and entering. Besides the drop in the number of overall burglaries, there is a striking shift to night-time, non-residential break-ins. This implies that the patrol is effective in deterring burglaries during their hours of operation. The areas which show a significant reduction are offenses dealing with narcotics, robberies, breaking
and entering, larceny, auto thefts, and vandalism.

The statistics in Appendix #1 are the patrol's log of calls, and they demonstrate very clearly that the patrol is successfully meeting some of its secondary goals. For example, part of the standard operating procedure of the patrol is to check on the security of buildings. The volume of complaints they send to BHA indicates that they have actively participated in the effort to tighten Bromley-Heath's security. The patrol has also successfully freed the police from many time-consuming activities in the community. This is shown by how many calls the patrol handles involving stolen or abandoned automobiles, juvenile delinquency, illegal pets, and elderly in need of assistance. The community definitely supports the patrol and refers problems to it. An important aspect of the patrol's success has been the sense among the citizens that their security and safety have been enhanced by the patrol.

Comparing the statistics of the patrol's log to the police department's crime reports, an important fact about the patrol is revealed. The patrol does not report all of its activities to the police. In fact, the only time they call the police is when they confront situations which they cannot handle. Thus, the police statistics and those of the patrol are very inconsistent in many offense categories. This can be demonstrated by this comparison:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Police Records</th>
<th>Patrol Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto theft</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse snatching</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evidence indicates that the patrol handles many problems itself without notifying the police department. This might also explain why there was a drop in the police crime statistics.

Even if the statistics were correct and crime had been reduced, the TMC has maintained it a top priority to make Bromley-Heath a safer place to live. They have gradually installed strong metal doors with better locks and peepholes to replace the older wooden ones. They also installed an outdoor lighting system which makes the area safer at night. The Community Service Center has been active in setting up alternatives to criminal or delinquent behavior. They opened up the Cave, a refreshment and recreation center for juveniles, and also have sponsored dances, trips, and informal parties. These activities offer alternative activities to juveniles and adults who might otherwise engage in criminal or delinquent behavior.

The conclusion of this study is that the Bromley-Heath patrol has made substantial headway toward the accomplishment of its secondary goals, but in terms of achieving their main goal of reducing the incidence of crime, the results are tenuous. To fully accomplish the main goal at Bromley-Heath will take a concerted effort of the patrol, the
police, the TMC, the Community Center, and the residents in general. The patrol still has a lot of work to do with regard to encouraging the other parties in this effort.

B. The Cathedral Project

The Cathedral Project in the South End has approximately 1,300 residents. The ethnic make-up of the population is mixed and includes: 750 black residents, 275 white residents, 260 Spanish-speaking residents, and 15 residents of other ethnic backgrounds. The development has 507 apartments arranged in an umbrella style design on 7.6 acres of land (see map, Appendix #8). There are a total of fifteen buildings, two of which are three stories high, while the rest are either six or ten-story high-rise units.

Within the South End, the reporting area, which comprises the Cathedral Housing Project and immediate environment, shows a very high level of crime as compared to other parts of the South End. Without a question, there is a degree of movement inside and outside of the development; however, the greater number of residents ought to be classified as non-transients as, in fact, close to 65% of them have been residents of the development for more than five years (Cathedral Profile, Appendix #5).

The area surrounding the immediate development is,

---

on the other hand, entirely different. In it, there is a high
degree of mobility among the inhabitants, which poses obvious
problems in terms of identifying and scrutinizing known crimi-
nals. Consequently, the difficulties in identifying criminals
who enter the development from the outside are thereby aggra-
vated.

• Unlike other parts of Boston, the South End cannot
be approached as a single neighborhood or community. It is
a vast area, and one of the largest ever designated as an
urban renewal project in the country, on a total of 616 acres.
The South End is something of a city in itself with more than
forty different ethnic and racial groups, a growing group of
young middle-class homeowners and renters, lodging-house room-
ers, transient skid row alcoholics, and so-called night people.
In fact, the ethnic make-up of the South End and the Cathedral
Project is one of the hidden quantities that must be consid-
ered when making recommendations for the development of man-
power in and around the Cathedral Project. This fact begins
to be extremely important when one recognizes that groups of
different races and ethnic derivations are engaged in some
forms of criminal activity in the area. The degree of involve-
ment of each group is dependent on its location and size. One
other very important point emerges clearly from this mix, and
that is that the various ethnic groups involved in crime rec-
ognize each other and co-exist in a kind of mutual defense
effort against law enforcement. These unique characteristics
of the South End make it difficult to categorize exactly who is committing what crime. In most other areas of the city, the criminal element can be described as predominantly one race or another, one ethnic group or another, and this assists the police often in crime detection, and sometimes in crime prevention.

Although the Cathedral Project is fairly large, the crime problem as described by the residents can be more definitely located in the area at the corner of #2 East Brookline and #1486A Washington Streets as well as in the parking lot and open areas around and between these buildings (see Appendix #8 map). But one cannot draw the conclusion that there is no crime problem in the rest of the development. However, the major problem areas can be specifically defined as well. It must be noted that the above-mentioned area is adjacent to Blackstone Park, an area which residents consider as the place where most crimes in the community begin and end.

Of course, there are many other problems affecting the development. But the greatest single problem is that of drug traffic. Residents witness transactions taking place out in the open in the streets and wonder why the police cannot put a stop to it. They express a real fear that the main flow of drugs in Boston is occurring in the South End and that it is centered around their own development.10

10 Interview with Ms. Romana Anderson, Director of
The pattern here seems to be that cars pull up in the open areas around certain buildings, and the sales are made right out in the open. Residents believe that the drug users support their habit by loitering in the stairways of the buildings after first shutting off the elevators in the high-rises, forcing the residents to walk up the stairs, and robbing them in the privacy of the stairwells.

The elderly residents of the Cathedral Project are especially victimized because their fear imprisons them in their homes. In addition, the criminals know when welfare and social security checks arrive in the mail and will often follow these people to the bank and rob them as they come out.

The situation came to the attention of the authorities in the summer of 1972 when a 75-year old tenant of 617 Harrison Avenue was stabbed to death as he was getting off the elevator. It was reported that he died instantly, and as a direct result of this tragedy, several elderly residents, assisted by other tenants and the tenant task force, attended the BHA Board meeting on August 15, 1972, and demanded greater security and security guards. At this meeting, the BHA Board passed a motion that "the administrator be and hereby is authorized to hire security guard service for project Mass. 2-6 (Cathedral) on an emergency basis and that the responsibility for hiring be his alone."

Royal Detective Agency, Inc. was hired on an emergency Cathedral Project's Security Program.
basis. They began operating in the project on August 30, 1972. They patrolled in two shifts between the hours of 8:00 A.M. to midnight, each shift consisting of two guardsmen and one supervisor. They physically patrolled all of the exterior and interior portions of buildings with special emphasis on 617 Harrison Avenue, the building predominantly occupied by elderly residents. The duties of the guards were to patrol in a manner that they would always be visible to anyone in the area. In the event that anything should occur, they would take the necessary action, including calling the proper authorities.

In the following year, life for the elderly at Cathedral improved markedly. While crime was not stopped, the attacks definitely diminished in frequency.

Later, a community security program was funded by the Mayor's Safe Streets Act under a LEAA grant called "South-End Neighborhood Action Program"(SNAP) whose purpose was to cover the areas of engraving, escorting, and house-watching. In the Engraving Program, individuals' social security numbers were engraved on their valuables. The Escorting Service provided help for the elderly who had to travel in the street for whatever reasons. The House-Watching contracts were made between neighbors, pledging mutually to watch each other's dwellings and to generally assist one another.

Unlike Bromley-Heath, where the security program functions as an extension of the police, Cathedral places more emphasis on crime-preventing activities, as illustrated by
the above programs. From the observations made during the study, it became fairly apparent that the way to the issue of protecting human lives in this project-community is directly connected to the idea of security. There is probably no single way in which it would be possible to simply eradicate the problems of crime, dope dealing, and arson in this area.

Presently, Cathedral Project has one guard around the clock and a second one for sixteen hours each day. There is also a LEAA-funded security program. The $80,000 LEAA program provides a patrol in the same five high-rise buildings in the center of the development where the guards work. An amount of $136,000 is being spent annually on the guards and the LEAA patrol, or more than $870 per unit in the five buildings. Yet, the buildings are still not secure; tenants have many complaints about both services, and Cathedral has one of the highest crime rates for its size of any BHA development. Some consideration should be given to reviewing both of these services.

Cathedral's files were examined to ascertain the activities of the security programs for a six-month period. The following is an attempt to reconstruct the operations of the Cathedral security program from January 1 to June 31, 1974. As with any study of this kind, its contents are necessarily determined by the availability of the relevant data and pertinent documentation. Certain documents relating to the operation of the program during the reporting period cited above
were, however, unfortunately not available.

Records of operations in the three service areas that have been the core of the program since its inception have been located and compiled. They cover the areas of Engraving, Escorting, and House-Watch. As for incident reports, most of them are missing, but data collected and compiled by the office of Officer Leo Guilleno of Columbia Point, Projects Security Program, are included to give a clearer idea of the crime incidents in Cathedral. The format is a month-to-month breakdown with the figures for people serviced (see Exhibits #1 to #5).

It is hoped that this presentation leaves the reader with a clear overview and insight into operations of the Cathedral Community Security Program.

1. Recommendations

The Community Patrol Program, which is based at 617 Harrison Avenue must be expanded and moved to the next high-rise building. It was always the primary objective to start in one building and to move from building to building, thereby making each building the subject matter of security. Each building would then receive its share of the educational programs, training, and physical security so as to stimulate interest in the programs as well as individual safety. This has not been done thus far, and the result is that the residents of 617 Harrison have come to depend on the presence of the guards, and the patrol is theirs exclusively. They do
EXHIBIT #1

SECURITY SERVICES RENDERED AT CATHEDRAL PROJECT
January-July 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Escort Service # Tenants</th>
<th>Service # Times</th>
<th>Engraving Service # Tenants</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>House-Watch Contracts # Signed Contracts</th>
<th>Incidents # Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>878</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>267</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above chart is a numerical explanation of the month-to-month services rendered by the security program. The numbers shown in the right column of each program activity represent the number of persons participating in the service, while the numbers in the left column of each program show the number of times services were administered.
April was the highest month for reported incidents. On March 29, one of the Cathedral tenants was murdered, thereby causing fear in the majority of residents which prompted them to report more crimes that might have gone by during less frightening times. During May and June, fear among the residents subsided, and people were not as suspicious and scared of moving physically within the project area.
During February, due to the fact that all program staff had been hired, the Program Director was able to accelerate the program so that it reached its highest point. During May and June, an all-time low occurred. Staff members had resigned during March and April which had a crippling effect on the program. However, it began to climb again as soon as new staff had been hired.

For May and June, figures coincide.
Horizontal lines = Number of Services Rendered
Slanted lines = Number of People Serviced
EXHIBIT #4
GRAPH OF ESCORTING

July reached highest total due to staff increase through summer workers from Neighborhood Youth Corporation, New York City. Tenants responding to them in large numbers. Over one third of all escort service performed in six occurred in July.

Total number of persons participating in the escort service from January through July was 334, with a total of 878 requests for service.

Horizontal lines = Number of Services Rendered
Slanted lines = Number of People Serviced
EXHIBIT #5
STATISTICAL REPORT ON HOUSE WATCH
January 1-August 19, 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th># Apartments</th>
<th># House Watches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 East Brookline</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 East Brookline</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 East Brookline</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 East Brookline</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 East Brookline</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 East Brookline</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 East Brookline</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Harrison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621A Harrison</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 Harrison</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611A Harrison</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>6 (2 vacant)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462 Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462A Washington</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486A Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Msgr. Reynolds</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 East Brookline</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617 Harrison</td>
<td>95 (appr. 12 vacant)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Family Building
- 6 East Brookline
- 8 East Brookline
- 12 East Brookline
- 18 East Brookline
- 22 East Brookline
- 24 East Brookline
- 631 Harrison
- 623 Harrison
- 619 Harrison
- 615 Harrison
- 27 Msgr. Reynolds
- 603 Harrison
- 31 Msgr. Reynolds
- 601 Harrison
- 35 Msgr. Reynolds
- 599 Harrison
17 Msgr. Reynolds
21 Msgr. Reynolds****
625 Harrison
627 Harrison
629 Harrison
605 Harrison
607 Harrison
609 Harrison

Totals: August 19 = 118
January to " = 235
Total apartments = 508

Please Note:

Large amounts of apartments are vacant, especially in building 617, also, a number of them are used for the operation of community agencies, i.e., Health Clinic, security programs, lounge areas, etc.

* = Buildings completed to-date, August 19, 1974.

The above statistics show that every building in existence throughout the project during the months of January to August was involved in the House Watch program with the largest buildings having the highest number of participants.
not want to share it, and they have not learned anything from the program.

It would be better to keep 617 Harrison Avenue locked up tight twenty-four hours a day, so that only tenants with keys or their invited guests can enter. Move the Community Patrol to 25 Msgr. Reynolds Road, and change the midnight to 4 AM guard to 4 PM to midnight, thereby creating two-man walking teams to five high-rise buildings between 4 PM and midnight. The total program would consist of two security guards from 8 AM to 4 PM and four from 4 PM to midnight. The move to 25 Msgr. Reynolds Road would not be made immediately. The time schedule would be between thirty and sixty days after the announcement of the change. In the meantime, BHA would be asked to rehabilitate the main doors, and the Patrol Program would perform an additional educational function: It would explain to the residents of 617 Harrison Avenue that the program is moving to 25 Msgr. Reynolds Road, and it would prepare them for keeping their building locked. The residents of 25 Msgr. Reynolds Road would be told of the move of the program; a telephone jack would be installed with the same phone number as previously in the hall, and the program must be developed so that it can operate from the present office at 617 Harrison Avenue, at 25 Msgr. Reynolds Road, or from any other building as it moves on laterally. Every precaution must be taken to prevent the feeling from developing that the security programs are abandoning one group or building
for the sake of another. It should be explained that the program must develop laterally or fail.

Special consideration must be given to elderly tenants. Their vulnerability to crime and vandalism constitutes a special dimension of the problem of public housing security, whether in the context of an elderly project or one where both elderly persons and families reside. Aside from the direct threat of crimes such as robbery and assault, the elderly are also susceptible to the greatest hardships resulting from vandalism. If an elevator is deliberately made inoperative by vandals, elderly residents will be virtually imprisoned in their apartments. On the other hand, there are special opportunities for effective security where the elderly are involved. They themselves are not a source of crime and vandalism. They tend to be acutely concerned about security and are usually disposed to offer the fullest cooperation in a security program.

There are generally ample reasons for giving serious consideration to a policy of housing the elderly in buildings or projects separate from those occupied by families. The elderly, not committing any offenses, are prime targets for offenses by younger residents of family projects, including the casual vandalism of juveniles. Exclusively elderly buildings can be effectively secured by relatively simple controls on access.

Where the option is available, the conversion of one
or more existing buildings or projects to exclusively elderly use should be considered. This solution usually requires extensive remodeling and may, thus, be an expensive alternative. But such new construction may make it possible to shift present elderly residents out of family projects as well as accommodating new elderly residents.

2. Conclusion

Here are some suggestions for Police Assistants. Although the existing security guard service and crime prevention program funded by LEAA represent steps in the right direction, I do not believe that these are adequate measures to successfully address the crime problem at the Cathedral Project. As a result of my discussions with various interested parties and my own analysis of the situation, I believe the implementation of the following measures would be helpful.

The problem of security in the Cathedral Development should be addressed as a joint effort by a special team policing unit, organized by District Four of BPD and assigned to the housing development.

The team policing unit should have two officers, both days and nights, assigned to perform vigorous, visible foot patrols of the open areas around the buildings and the areas where criminal operations have taken place. Also, the team policing unit supervisor should visit Cathedral Project more often.
District Four and other supporting police motor vehicles assigned to the area should provide a mobile patrol in the area around the development, particularly targeting the Blackstone Park area and the corner of Washington and East Brookline Streets as well as 617 Harrison Avenue which appear to be central areas for criminal activity.

Detectives from District Four or BPD Headquarters should make periodic sweeps through the development, so as to mount an ever-increasing pressure against the criminal element.

The BHA employees and residents must develop procedures of reporting criminal activities promptly whenever they see any. Thus, all available forces, including the private company and the LEAA funded program members will be combined in a concentrated effort to assist the police.
CHAPTER IV

GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING SECURITY IN PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

A. Supplemental Security Personnel

Once the commitment to fight crime problems is established, the Local Housing Authority (LHA) and the tenants are in a position to discuss the various alternatives suitable to the site. Whether security personnel consists of a single night watchman or of patrolmen and stationary guards, their major objective should be non-violent deterrence, designed to dissuade potential offenders from attempting crimes or to detect and stop crimes before they can be completed.

They should rely upon Police Department back-up for apprehension and arrest. Yes, security presence is very important, and high visibility is imperative. But the clout of security personnel of this type depends on their actual ability to use force if need be or if they are able to obtain immediate police assistance. In any case, it is recommended that they use as little force as possible.

1. Types of Functions of Security Personnel

The functions of a security patrol depend a great deal on the type of power the patrol members have legally in the jurisdiction where they are operating. All levels of police personnel, including security personnel, have to obey certain legislative ordinances which vary from state to state.
Some of their powers are defined by Corman and Fielding as follows:

(1) Police officer/peace officer: sworn officer, normally vested with 24-hour, statewide authority, with a specific bailiwick; for example, state patrol, highways; county sheriff, unincorporated county areas; and municipal police, city limits.

(2) Special police officers, public agencies: officers for hire, certified with limited authority during specific hours of duty, specific hours of duty at specific locations.

(3) Private police officers, private agencies: officers for hire, certified, with limited authority during specific hours of duty, at specific locations, normally private property.¹¹

There is but little variance between all three categories when the officer is on the job. However, local ordinances or employee duty requirements may limit the scope of duty by the state statutes. The supplemental officer can perform three basic types of operational functions: patrolling, stationary guarding, and monitoring of electronic alarm and surveillance systems.

Patrolling is most often used to cover project grounds with on-call response to incidents within buildings. However, "vertical patrolling" (e.g., systematic patrol of common interior areas such as lobbies, elevators, hallways, and fire escapes) can be a highly effective use of security manpower.

Stationary Guards are most often used to provide security at lobby entrances, and in that capacity, they are usually called doormen or lobby monitors. A guard positioned at an outdoor station, which commands main exterior approaches, recreational areas, and parking lots may well be the most cost-effective guard.

Monitors of Electronic Alarms and Surveillance Systems serve as informational relays and must be able to secure prompt dispatch of police officers or security patrolmen to the scene of security emergency.

2. Types of Security Personnel Organizations

Where a sizable number of security personnel is used, the type of organizational structure is a crucial consideration. The previously discussed issues regarding scope and type of functions have to be largely resolved before determining the specific type of organization to be used. Security personnel organizations can be divided into three basic categories which might be used singly or in combinations.

a. Management Security Forces are an integral part of management's overall organizational structure. Their members are paid employees of management which thus has the normal authority of any employer over hiring, supervision, and discharge. Security forces of this type have various scopes of functions as discussed above.

b. Resident/Tenant Patrols, in their purest form, are wholly comprised of volunteer residents of the project
and may operate as independent organizations or under the auspices of general residents' organizations. However, management sometimes pays for such items as uniforms and equipment and, in some instances, even pays patrol supervisors for their services. The degree of management control depends largely upon its financial support.

Even though an organization is called a resident or tenant patrol, if all its members become paid employees of management, the real nature of the organization approximates that of a management security force. Resident patrols are advised to give due consideration to this option. While the impetus to establish a resident patrol usually comes from residents themselves, if management discerns a certain receptiveness to this option among residents, it might well take the lead in encouraging and guiding resident participation of this type.

B. Contract Guard Services

Kakalik and Wildborn describe contract guard services as follows:12

Contract Guard Services may be purchased by management from commercial agencies. Personnel are employees of the agency, rather than management, and the basis for management supervision is thus apt to be tenuous. Management's only recourse for poor performance may be the difficult one of terminating the

contract. While the quality of services varies greatly among different contract guard agencies, a recent study published by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration stated: "In a real sense, many of the problems associated with the private security industry are the result of using low-paid, low-quality, under-educated, and untrained employees.

1. Administration, Training, and Equipment for Public Housing Security Force

Where a sizable management security force is employed, careful attention must be given to the following points regarding administration, training, and equipment.

   a. Management Control over the security force should be strictly maintained. The force should be an integral component of the overall management structure, with clearly defined lines of accountability to the general management staff.

   b. Qualifications for Supervisors must be especially high. The chief supervisory officer of a large security force should be selected with extreme care and should be well-qualified by training, experience, and temperament. The ideal person for this crucial job is one who has had professional police training, economy and administration; who has a thorough appreciation of social dynamics; and who possesses a generous capacity for human sensitivity and compassion. The chief supervisory officer must be able to command respect and work closely with other management personnel, residents, the police department, and local social services agencies.

   c. Personnel Selection Standards should be stringent, and applicants should be carefully screened. Security
personnel must be able to inspire general confidence and respect as well as to perform the specific tasks assigned to them. Screening should take special care to eliminate applicants who are emotionally unfit or who are likely to abuse the authority entrusted to security personnel.

d. Employment of Residents for management security has generally brought highly favorable results and is strongly recommended. A prime advantage is that residents know the project and the other residents, and they tend to become strongly committed to their jobs. A possible disadvantage is that residents may be subject to undue pressures by their neighbors. It may be a good policy to give residents first preference for employment but not to restrict employment to residents.

e. Training is essential for all security personnel.

... A formal training course of four to six weeks duration is definitely recommended for members of a large security force, but even a single doorman or night watchman should receive some formal or informal training. Training should be conducted by qualified professionals and should cover general management structure and operations, physical and social characteristics of the project, policing techniques and equipment, social aspects of the security guard's role, and the purpose, organization, and specific functions of the security force. Regular police officers, social service professionals, and leaders of the tenants' organization as well as management officers should participate in training sessions. Special attention should be given to use of weapons (if any) and where firearms are to be issued to patrolmen or guards, it is imperative that they receive thorough training in their use.13

13Kakalik and Wildborn, p. 65.
f. **Cost** of security personnel are high. Salaries and benefits take the largest part of overall costs, but equipment alone can require substantial expenditures. Salaries vary greatly, depending upon prevailing local wage rates and the qualifications and duties expected.

g. **Equipment** should include reliable two-way communication units, linked to the security force dispatcher or Police Department. It may be advisable to add self-defensive weapons, although they should by no means be regarded as standard. Firearms are the most controversial type of equipment and should be issued only if considered necessary for self-defense, and only to responsible and well-trained individuals. Also, the entire question of firearms and other weapons should be discussed with the tenants who are sometimes strongly opposed to their issuance to security personnel.

Patrol cars can be justified only for policing large areas. Motor scooters or bicycles provide more flexible mobility. These and central communications equipment should be carefully selected, and the assistance of the Police Department or other law enforcement professionals is essential.

2. **The Role of Residents in Project Security**

The importance of the role of residents in controlling crime and vandalism cannot be overemphasized. No security program can succeed without the support and cooperation of at least a large majority of the residents themselves. Their role begins with individual responsibility for their own
self-protection and, of course, with observance of the law and other community standards. A major dimension of the role of residents is the potential of residents' organizations to participate in the planning and implementation of security programs. Management should take the lead in showing residents what they can do to improve security and to bring in the security program. Once this start is made, residents can usually be expected to assume a considerable degree of initiative and responsibility, although management should provide continuing support and guidance. 14

3. Management Role in Planning and Coordination

There are two areas of management responsibility in connection with the security of its project. One is overall planning responsibility. Management should take the initiative in planning a security program for the project and should exercise primary responsibility for carrying out the overall planning effort. Because of its controlling role, daily involvement and long-term interests in the project, management is in a unique position to take the lead in security planning. The plain fact is that, if management does not assume this responsibility, none of the other key participants is likely to be willing or able to do so.

Management should take primary responsibility for

14 Corman and Fielding, pp. 277-81.
overall coordination of the project's security program. This means management ought to attempt to perform or even supervise all key participants on a continuing basis and initiate such actions as may, from time to time, become necessary to assure coordination of those functions.

4. Funding Sources

a. Operating and Residual Receipts

In the public housing program, operating receipts (including subsidies for operations) may be used for a wide variety of security measures, largely at the budgetary discretion of the LHA. These funds may well be inadequate where extensive security measures are needed. However, analysis of how to finance a security program should, in all instances, begin with consideration of such funds. In analyzing the potential for financing security measures out of the regular operating budget, management should take into account the extent to which losses or expenses due to crime and vandalism (e.g., vacancy losses, maintenance, repairs, damages assessed in liability lawsuits) might be offset against the cost of improved security.

b. Low-Rent Public Housing Modernization Funds

Some LHAs may still have unexpended modernization funds. Such funds can be used only for capital improvements. An LHA may, with Housing and Urban Development (HUD) approval, use modernization funds for protective hardware
(locks, peep-holes, protective grilles or screens, electronic alarm or surveillance equipment, etc.) as well as for structural modifications related to security, provided that such measures constitute capital improvements.

c. Supplemental Loans

Such loans may be insured under Section 241 of the National Housing Act by HUD to pay for alterations, repairs, additions, or improvements to a multi-family housing project financed under a HUD-insured mortgage. An owner of such a project might use loan proceeds to fund the purchase and installation of security hardware or to make structural modifications, designed to improve security.

d. LEAA-Funded Programs

The LEAA of the Department of Justice makes grants to state Law Enforcement Planning Agencies and to state and local governments which, in turn, fund specific local programs (see Appendix #4).

e. State and Local Governments

Management should explore possibilities for funding of security programs through state and local governments. In addition to straight grants, the possibilities include remission of taxes or of payments in lieu of taxes in consideration of management-funded security services and special funding arrangements for the augmentation of regular police services.
C. Conclusion

These guidelines were designed as an introduction to the subject of Public Housing Security and do not presume to be an exhaustive coverage of this very complex subject. The author strongly recommends that users supplement this introduction with further investigation of detailed technical information from other sources (i.e., technical publications and consultation with qualified professionals in security and law enforcement). While it is hoped that every public housing project can benefit from these guidelines, it is recognized that the more fundamental aspects covered here will be of greatest interest to those projects which are only beginning to become involved with a systematic approach to their security problems.

Government as landlord has a special obligation to improve security in public housing. The HUD should continue to encourage LHAs to meet their responsibilities in this area and provide whatever assistance is possible. In addition to sponsoring pilot or demonstration programs, the Federal Government should serve in a clearinghouse function, so that LHAs can obtain useful information about security hardware, design modifications, tenant patrols, and public housing guard forces.
CHAPTER V

AN OVERVIEW OF THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGED OF TENANT PATROLS

Tenant patrols usually come into existence as a result of residents' dissatisfaction with existing police services or as a result of some shared concern about criminal activities or crimes that have taken place in the neighborhood or development.

Tenant patrols have a useful role to play by helping and assisting a guard service or as an alternative private security method. The most important thing that must be taken into consideration when making a decision for this form of security service is that the role of the tenant patrol should be narrowly defined. This is to avoid overlapping of duties with other security methods, both private and public. Tenant patrols should play a relatively simple and exact role. Their purpose is to deter criminal activity by their presence. Therefore, their functions should be those of a passive guard, which is to watch for criminals or suspicious conduct, and alert the police when they see it. In general, the functions should be the same regardless of whether the patrol is stationary or mobile. The following is a discussion of some of the advantages and disadvantages of this form of security.

Used solely for patrolling, it would add enormously to police costs. In New York, it has been estimated that
one added patrolman costs the equivalent of then times his annual salary.15

Patrols can be effective in performing a surveillance function. It is a glorified myth that all police activities require expert training and legal arrest powers. Many of these tasks can be performed by anyone of sound mind in the community. Surveillance of housing projects is one such task. Tenant patrols in project areas can perform this task as well and, in some cases, better than the police. This conclusion is reached because most patrol members are generally residents of that project or live in the immediate vicinity. They are familiar with most of the tenants and their daily routine. This makes it easier for them to spot an intruder or suspicious activities.

Tenant patrols are formed because a stressful situation comes into existence in their neighborhood. These people come together because they have a common concern of making their community a safe place to live. Once the hue and cry goes out, tenant participation is almost immediate; therefore, becoming manpower intensive can happen in a matter of minutes. They utilize a resource that is plentiful among project dwellers: spare-time which many of them have, and they do not require substantial amounts of other resources that most people lack. A lot of their surveillance functions can be

15New York City Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee, 1971 Criminal Justice Plan.
done right from their own building.

According to Arnold Sagglyn,

Patrols indirectly improve the individual's ability to deal with crime. Experience on a citizen patrol is likely to make an individual more aware of security needs. This person will be more likely to be on the alert for crime or suspicious behavior within his neighborhood or development, even when he is not on patrol. He will know how to report a crime and will probably be more willing to do so. 16

Patrols aid in achieving better social service programs in the development. Because of the residents' joint actions on crime problems, access to other needs can be achieved with greater cohesion among the group. If there is no existing tenant organization, patrol members can serve as catalysts in its formation. Just being in a patrol provides useful activity for tenants who would otherwise be idle.

Patrols have their advantages and disadvantages the same as any other group. However, the seriousness of their weaknesses should be examined as intensively as their strengths. The problem with tenant patrols can be traced back to their initial formation and the duties they took on as a patrol. According to Sagglyn,

Patrols tend to be short-lived and are generally organized when concern about crime, sometimes specific types of crime such as rape or urban rioting, is particularly acute. Shared concern, then, is both a

necessary condition for establishing a patrol and a possible reason for its demise. While the patrol may increase neighborhood cohesion, assuming broad enough participation, continued fear may weaken this cohesion, eventually destroying the patrol itself.¹⁷

Just being the eyes and ears of the police is not always enough for some patrol members. The legal system provides little middle ground between the sworn police officers and the ordinary citizen. Therefore, a patrol member who detains or confronts a suspect may be committing a crime himself with assault, battery, kidnapping, and false arrest. Some patrol members disregard the legal restrictions accompanying their activities.

Another reason why patrols tend to be short-lived is "boredom." A burst of enthusiasm from volunteer patrol lasts only as long as the action is high. When things slow down in the project, people tend to lose interest, and the patrol quickly deteriorates.

The police will be reluctant to cooperate with patrols and may even oppose them. The police are now saying that, although they understand and appreciate the efforts of tenant patrols, they find in some cases individual patrol members using poor judgment and creating dilemmas. Also, this additional layer of persons tends to slow down information flow to police, thereby interfering with police response time.

The patrol may aggravate community tension. According

¹⁷ Sagglyn, et al.
to Sagglyn,

A tenant patrol may actually accentuate some community problems, especially where substantial ethnic or class differences exist. Police routinely deal with family and personal crises, precisely those matters one seeks to hide from other community members. A community patrol is, in a sense, an organized squad of nosy neighbors. Some tenants may be extremely upset about the intrusion on their privacy and the arrogation of government functions that is implied. The problem of increased community tension or conflict may be particularly critical when the patrol is patterned along political or ethnic lines.

In summary, an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of patrols shows, in my opinion, that the advantages are far greater than the drawbacks. I feel the formation of tenant patrols and guards represents an important form of citizen participation in neighborhood affairs. Unlike other crime prevention activities, most of which require residents only to be more alert and sensitive to security measures as they go about their daily affairs, being a patrol member or guard demands active organizational support and personal commitment on a routine basis. In fact, this very characteristics make it a significant form of citizen participation when compared to any kind of organization that starts by a voluntary effort.

Low-income people--in this case, project dwellers--have fewer attachments to the community, hence, fewer organizational ties, and ultimately, less incentive to support the rules according to which community affairs are generally
conducted. All citizens are capable of performing an important role in the fight against crime and should be encouraged to do so. Perhaps, the most effective stand against crime a public housing tenant can take is to get out and actively participate in pursuing solution with his neighbors. Commitment and involvement are more beneficial than hiding behind locked doors, waiting for the police, the courts, or elected officials to create a sense of security in the neighborhood.
APPENDICES #1-12
The following Appendices are included to give the reader background material on the case studies and such information as crime statistics as referred to in the text. Also included are copies of grant proposals, administered by LEAA through local state and city agencies as well as other material relevant to this report.
# APPENDIX #1

BROMLEY-HEATH COMMUNITY PATROL LOG

First Year: June, 1972 - May, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENT</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting Stolen Goods</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugging</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse Snatching</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of Stolen Goods</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft - Reported or Found</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Automobile</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding Vehicle</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegally Parked Automobile</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Reported</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Fire Reported</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Assistance Requested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disturbance of the Peace)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disperse Crowds or Fights</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Aid Administered</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist to Hospital</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Housing Authority Maintenance Requested</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic Juveniles</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Child</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic Adults</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Pet in Apartment</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addicts Administering in Hallways</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Escort or Delivery</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loitering in Hallways</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Complaints</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Beating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX #2
BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
BROMLEY-HEATH
POLICE CRIME STATISTICS
June, 1972 - May, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENT</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault and Battery</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery - not including Taxi or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse Snatching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse Snatching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny - except Purse Snatching</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Fire Alarm</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assaults</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX #3

BROMLEY-HEATH COMMUNITY PATROL

BUDGET

March 1, 1975 - December 31, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State Buy-In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PERSONNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Director at $275.00/wk.</td>
<td>11,125</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 43 wks. = $11,825.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Manager of Operations at $191.00/wk.</td>
<td>7,613</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 43 wks. = $8,213.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Field Supervisors at $162.00/wk.</td>
<td>19,302</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each x 43 wks. = $20,898.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Patrolmen at $145.00/wk.</td>
<td>57,550</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each x 43 wks. = $62,350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dispatchers at $140.00/wk.</td>
<td>11,240</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each x 43 wks. = $12,040.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Secretary at $140.00/wk.</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 43 wks. = $6,020.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB TOTAL</td>
<td>121,346</td>
<td>8,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits 20%</td>
<td>24,269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL</td>
<td>145,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Defense</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Fees and Cost</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. CONSULTANT FEES AND CONTRACTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Preparation</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance: (Auto, Bonding, Liability &amp;Theft)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Uniform Maintenance
- Office Machine Repairs: 200
- Communications Equipment Repair: 800
- Vehicle Maintenance: 800
- **Total**: $3,250

### D. TRAVEL
- Local Travel: 340
- Out-of-State: 500
- Gas and Oil for Jeep: 1,425
- **Total**: $2,265

### E. OFFICE AND ADMINISTRATION
- Meeting Expenses: 500
- Office Supplies: 400
- Telephone: 800
- Re-Production Cost: 340
- Printing & Information Expenses: 450
- Miscellaneous Supplies: 484
- Postage: 300
- **Total**: $3,274

### F. EQUIPMENT
- Uniforms: 1,000

### G. OTHER
- Indirect Costs: 12,135
- **Total**: $160,143

**GRAND TOTAL**: $169,039
This proposal is submitted to obtain continuation funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) for the Bromley-Heath Community Patrol for the fiscal year 1975. The Bromley-Heath Community Patrol will continue in its role of providing security and other services to the residents of the public housing development it serves. Generally, the major goals of this project for the coming year are:

1. Maintain the patrol in full operation and increase its ability to function as a crime prevention force within the community.

2. Continue to work towards better relationships between the community and the Boston Police Department.

BACKGROUND

The Bromley-Heath Housing project consists of two low-income developments squeezed into seven acres of the Jamaica Plain section of Boston. The projects contain seventeen three-story buildings and sixteen six and seven story structures. Of the 2,500 people living in the projects, seventy percent are under twenty-one. Most of the residents are black, with a sprinkling of Spanish-speaking and elderly whites.

Bromley-Heath is a well organized community, but like many low-income projects, deteriorating and overcrowded conditions are evident. The layout of the buildings provides an optimum environment for criminal activity; labyrinth entrances, dark stairways, halls, and elevators hide purse snatchers and muggers, while unlocked outside doors and rooftops provide them means of escape.
LEAA GRANT PROPOSAL FOR BROMLEY-HEATH, 1975

In an effort to reduce a rapidly increasing crime rate, community residents and representatives of the Boston Police Department, Police Patrolman's Association and Mayor's Safe Streets Act Advisory Committee worked together to formulate plans for a community patrol for the Bromley-Heath development. This Community Patrol began its street operation in June of 1972, and with LEAA funding has continued since then to serve the needs of the community.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PATROL AND ITS OPERATION

The Bromley-Heath Community Patrol operates three hundred and sixty-two days per year, seven days per week, fourteen and one-half hours per day, with a staff of 20 employees. Each staff member is concerned and familiar with the needs of the community and all are fully trained to meet these needs in accordance with the operating procedures of the patrol. Each community worker must complete training in the following subjects:

1. Standard First Aid
2. Self Defense
3. Communication and Radio Procedures
5. Community and Community Agencies Familiarization

Personnel of the Bromley-Heath consist of the following:

1. One Director
2. One Manager of Operations (Assistant Director)
3. Three Field Supervisors
4. One Secretary
5. Two Dispatchers
6. One Bookkeeper
7. Eleven Community Workers (Patrolmen/Patrolwomen)

There are two patrolwomen and nine patrolmen who physically patrol the housing projects on alternating shifts (under the supervision of the field supervisors) for a period of fourteen and one-half hours per day. The Field Supervisors are responsible for the overall field operations, including on-the-job training for all new patrolmen or patrolwomen. They also are responsible for advising or assisting the tenants of the development in all matters that can be solved immediately. Each has the responsibility of directing the patrolmen in any given situation that may occur in the field of operations. The Manager of Operations is responsible to the Director and for
the Field Supervisors. His duties include preparation of the work schedule and overall responsibility for training of new patrolmen. He controls and manages all supplies, equipment, community relations, and any information that concerns the operation of the patrol or the security needs of the community. He also assists as the liaison between the Boston Police Department and the Bromley-Heath Community Patrol.

The Director is responsible for the administration and operation of the patrol. His responsibilities include budget preparation, fund raising, and proposal writing. The director is also responsible for liaison between patrol and the Boston Police Department. He investigates and makes decisions in any situation having to do with the security of the Bromley-Heath Housing Projects. He makes monthly reports to the City of Boston, Boston Police Department and the committees representing the community, concerning the number and nature of all incidents that occur or are reported to the patrol during that period. He also analyzes repeated incidents and takes necessary corrective action by reporting such incidents to the proper authorities and determining strategies to prevent their recurrence. The Director is familiar with the community, its agencies, and keeps in contact with them on a regular basis.

The patrolmen and patrolwomen are the backbone of the patrol. Their activities in the field must be proper and precise and they must be able to deal with all kinds of situations using good judgment at all times. They must also set the example of a model citizen and show concern for the community which they serve. Each patrolman or patrolwoman has the responsibility for visibly and physically patrolling the entire Bromley-Heath Housing Development, under the supervision of the field supervisors. They are also responsible for maintaining good community relations.

There are two dispatchers who deploy and direct field operations of the patrol by means of radio communication. The dispatchers are also responsible for logging all incoming and outgoing information having to do with the patrol's operation. They dispatch all equipment, including radios and the Patrol's vehicle. They must be fully trained in the use of communication equipment and the codes used in receiving or passing on information. They must be familiar with the complete area of operation (community) in order to direct patrolmen to the scene of incidents. The Secretary is responsible for all clerical functions including time keeping, logging in and out of stolen properties, and assisting in administrative operations.

The Patrol has a minimum inventory of uniforms and equipment which include the following:

1. Seven Walkie-Talkies
2. One Receiver
3. One four-wheel drive vehicle (jeep)
4. Office Equipment

Each patrolman or patrolwoman is issued uniforms which include the following:

1. One hat
2. One winter/summer jacket
3. Two winter/summer trousers
4. Four khaki shirts
5. One women's winter/summer jacket
6. Two women's winter/summer skirts
7. Two women's khaki blouses
8. One necktie
9. Two khaki trousers
10. One belt
11. One rain coat
12. One winter parka w/hood
13. One set handcuffs w/key
14. One clipboard
15. One notebook
16. One flashlight

The above uniforms and equipment are the amount issued to each of the following:

1. Director
2. Manager of Operations
3. Three Field Supervisors
4. Nine Patrolmen
5. Two Patrolwomen

SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE PATROL TO THE COMMUNITY ARE:

1. Daily and routine duties of providing security by visibly patrolling the entire Bromley-Heath Housing Projects from 07:00 to 21:30 hours daily.

2. Providing emergency First Aid and hospital transportation where ambulance service is not available.

3. Special Senior Citizen coverage, particularly on check or shopping days.

4. Special house watch and escort services within the community upon request.

5. Hourly building and area checks including the following: stairways, hallways, windows, rooftops, parking lots, driveways, and play areas.

6. Regulation of speed or motor vehicles within the project and reporting of violations to the registry.

7. The monitoring of school exodus (operation 10-500) from 7:30-9:30 a.m. and 2:00-3:00 p.m.

8. Instruction of standard first aid within the community and community schools.
9. Instruction of self-defense to the female population of the community.

10. Working of a volunteer basis with the youth of the development.

11. Escort services for residents, delivery companies and the general public on request.

12. Where feasible, recovery of stolen property.

SUMMARY

No major changes are planned for the operation of the Bromley-Heath Community Patrol in the coming year. It is expected that 1975 will be the final year of LEAA support for this project, and efforts will be made to obtain alternative sources of funds during the coming year. Formal evaluation and informal talks with community residents testify to the fact that this Patrol has made a major difference in providing for a community which has a reduced crime rate and an increased sense of security on the part of development tenants. The staff of the Bromley-Heath pledges to continue to work towards a community which is a safe and pleasant place to live.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Committee on Criminal Justice  
CASH MATCHING CERTIFICATE

Award of 1975 funds for Committee on Criminal Justice projects is contingent upon receipt and expenditure of cash matching appropriations by grantee units of government during the period of the projects. Total cash match required is 10% of total project costs, half of which (5%) is provided by the state, and the other half must be appropriated by local grantees. The state buy-in can also be computed on the basis of 5.555% of the federal award amount. Using this method, the total match required is 11.110% of the federal award amount. State agencies receiving federal grants must provide the full amount of the match.

Therefore, awards of 1975 funds by the Committee will require the completion of the following certification:
The City of Boston/Suffolk County herewith certifies that an appropriation of at least $8,896.00 designated for the purpose of matching LEAA funds will be sought from the governmental body responsible for appropriating funds for the grantee at the earliest opportunity which will be on or before ____________________.

The Committee must be kept informed of the status of the appropriation request in the grantee's budgeting and appropriation process. If no funds are appropriated for matching purposes, the grantee agrees to return to the Committee $160,143.00.

Signed ____________________

Title ____________________
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The City of Boston/Suffolk County herewith certifies that an appropriation of at least $8,896.00 designated for the purpose of matching LEAA funds will be sought from the governmental body responsible for appropriating funds for the grantee at the earliest opportunity which will be on or before ________________.

The Committee must be kept informed of the status of the appropriation request in the grantee's budgeting and appropriation process. If no funds are appropriated for matching purposes, the grantee agrees to return to the Committee $160,143.00.
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GRANT AWARD
Attachment A

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

Project No. 75C-197.0350

Approval of the application by the Boston/Suffolk for programs or projects related to Bromley-Heath Community Patrol as authorized by Section 303-304 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351, P.L. 91-644 and P.L. 93-83), is contingent upon the grantees compliance with the following Special Conditions:

1. Grantee agrees to submit for MCCJ approval prior to funding, a corrected budget reflecting actual federal award amount in (160,143) state buy-in funds.

2. Revise budget to reflect 6.2% cost of living increase.

3. Documentation for 15% fringe.

4. Justification items budgeted under consultant category (6,500).

5. Justification for meeting expense, reproduction costs and printing cost budgeted in Office & Administration.

6. Grantee agrees to gather, maintain and submit data on a quarterly basis, re: reported crime, resident requests for transfer, vacancies and vacancy rates.

7. Unless the project is initiated and funds have begun to be meaningfully expended within 90 days of the receipt of signed GAP, the project is automatically terminated and any funds received must be returned forthwith to the Committee.

8. Resumes of final candidates for professional positions must be submitted to the Committee for review prior to any notification to any candidate of the grantees intention to hire.

9. Grantee agrees to submit for MCCJ approval by June 30, 1975, a budget reflecting in-kind matching contribution.
Honorable Kevin H. White
Mayor, City of Boston
c/o M.S.S.A.A.C.
80 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116

Dear Mayor White:

On behalf of the Committee on Criminal Justice, I am pleased to forward the formal Grant Award Documents, approved by the Committee, for:

Grantee: City of Boston/Suffolk County

Project No. 75C-197.0350

Short Title: Boston Community Crime Prevention--Bromley Heath Community Patrol

Award Amount: $160,143.00
Once these documents have been reviewed, completed, signed, and returned to the Committee, we will forward an initial check for you and your grant.

The documents consist of:

1. **The Grant Award, (GPSC-11)**, including Attachment "A", Special Conditions Applicable to this grant. Added to these, and to be considered as an integral part, are "Conditions Applicable to the Fiscal Administration of Grants" and "General Conditions Applicable to the Administration of Grants" under Part C, Title I, P.L. 90-351, P.L. 91-644 and P.L. 93-83.

   **Necessary Action:** The front sheet must be signed by the Chief Executive Officer.

2. **Partial Financial Report and Fund Request (GPSC-12 and 12h) and instructions.**

   **Necessary Action:** Must be completed and signed by the Project Financial Officer.

3. **Cash Matching Certificate (GPSC-16)**

   **Necessary Action:** Must be signed by the Chief Executive Officer.

We have included two complete sets of documents. The original set (signed by the Governor and Attorney General) should be returned to:
The Committee on Criminal Justice
Room 725
80 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116

no later than

The second set is for your files.

If you have any questions or find that you will be unable to return the signed documents within the specified time, please contact Sharon Smith, who is a member of my staff, and may be reached at 727-6608.

Sincerely,

Arnold R. Rosenfeld
Executive Director

ARR: nm
Enclosures
APPENDIX #5
**APPENDIX #5**

**DEVELOPMENT PROFILE--CATHEDRAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOUTH END CATHEDRAL</th>
<th>ADDRESS 617 Harrison Avenue Boston 02118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-13</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>16-18</th>
<th>19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>46-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>71+</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table includes both current residents and former residents who moved out in the period 7/74 to 7/75 in the following proportions:

**CURRENT RESIDENTS:** 1127  
**FORMER RESIDENTS:** 129

**AGE OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent over age 60</th>
<th>Percent under age 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHA FAMILY DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>36% 28%</td>
<td>14% 15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% 25%</td>
<td>15% 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FAMILY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA Percent</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA Percent</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEAN FAMILY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA FAMILY DEVELOPMENTS (MEAN)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-ELDERLY SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA FAMILY DEVELOPMENTS (MEAN)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MINORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Parents</th>
<th>284</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Minors</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors Per Parent</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank Order Position Among 23 Family Developments</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes current residents and moveouts 7/74-7/75
### RACE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHA (Family)</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>2-6</th>
<th>BHA (Family)</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>2-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non White</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>2-6</th>
<th>BHA Family developments (Median)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Family Income</td>
<td>$1275</td>
<td>$1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gross Family Income</td>
<td>$3952</td>
<td>$4104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Earning Less Than $4,000</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Earning More Than $10,000</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FAMILIES WITH EMPLOYED WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank Order Among 23 Family Developments, Percent of Families With No Workers, 1975 (Rank From Highest To Lowest): 8

### PERCENT OF FAMILIES RECEIVING AFDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>2-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962 (Federal)</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Change 1969-1975
MEAN CONTRACT RENT

NO. 2-6
BHA Family Developments

$59.29
$59.41

PERCENT OF FAMILIES IN ARREARS OVER 30 DAYS

June, 1969 June, 1975

NO. 2-6
BHA Family Developments

2% 23%
7% 23%

VACANCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Units Occupied</th>
<th>Units Vacant</th>
<th>Percent Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June, 1975</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 1969</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 1966</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BHA Mean BHA Median

14.3% 3.6%
8.0% 3.7%
2.5% 1.4%

REPUTATION SURVEY SCORE

On a scale of 1.0 (Very Good) to 7.0 (Very Bad)

Overall 5.2
Physical 5.0
Social 5.4

REVEALED PREFERENCE FOR DEVELOPMENT

Number of moveouts (Turnover), 7/74 - 7/75 77
Number of Applicants on Waiting List, 7/75 350
Estimated Mean Length of Wait (Years) 4.55
BHA Family Development Estimated Length of Wait (Years)
Mean 3.69
Median 4.69
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>BHA MEAN</th>
<th>BHA MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Move-outs as percent of occupied units, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>BHA MEAN</th>
<th>BHA MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Move-outs as percent of units for dwelling use, 1969.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>BHA MEAN</th>
<th>BHA MEDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Move-outs as percent of units for dwelling use, 1975

**LENGTH OF RESIDENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>BHA Median 1969</th>
<th>BHA Median 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent less than 5 years in residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>BHA Median 1969</th>
<th>BHA Median 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent more than 20 years in residence

End of Initial Occupancy Period

12/31/51

Units Built

508

Units Lost to Stock Through:

Net Breakthroughs

Agency Use

6

Net Units in 1975

502
## AS BUILT DWELLING

### UNIT MIX

| 1 | BR | 160 |
| 2 | BR | 164 |
| 3 | BR | 160 |
| 4 | BR | 24  |
| 5 | BR |     |
| 6 | BR |     |
| 7+| BR |     |
| TOTAL | 508 |

**Land Area:** 7.16 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>2-6</th>
<th>BHA Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Coverage</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Units Per Acre</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Per Acre</td>
<td>157.4</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children* Per Acre</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Children -- Ages 11 - 18*
APPENDIX #6

CATHEDRAL PROJECT CRIMES REPORTED TO THE BOSTON POLICE

ON POLICE DISTRICT FOUR DURING 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED CRIMES</th>
<th>DISTRICT 4</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>CATHEDRAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 166</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicides</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>3052</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part I</td>
<td>11,420</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part II</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td>18,565</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX #7
POLICE REPORTING AREA #166
CATHEDRAL PROJECT

Shawmut Avenue

Washington Street

Cathedral Development

Old Malden Street

Harrison Avenue
APPENDIX #8

CATHEDRAL PROJECT MAJOR CRIME AREAS

The area below marked by the black line is the area of the highest crime rate in the development.
## APPENDIX #9
### CATHEDRAL SECURITY PROGRAM

#### BUDGET

### A. PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1-100%</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workers</td>
<td>3-100% @ $9,500</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workers</td>
<td>2-50% @ $5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1-100%</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits (15% of Salaries)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing, Postage</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Newsletters (10 issues)</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox, Mimeo of information materials</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification Badges</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription, Conference fees</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental of films</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes (24-½ hr. tapes)</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrips (processing, printing of film)</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration materials (peepholes, locks, chains etc.)</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. TRAVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease of Van (50%) including insurance</td>
<td>$1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Travel</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-town-travel</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Overhead (10% of Personnel)</td>
<td>$7,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUEST** $88,143
ORGANIZATION

UNITED SOUTH END SETTLEMENTS' CATHEDRAL COMMUNITY SECURITY PROGRAM

The Cathedral Community Security Program became operational in March 1975 with the following staff: a project director (part-time), a project coordinator (full-time), three community workers (full-time), two community workers (part-time) and a secretary. Later in the year the two part-time community work positions were consolidated into one full-time position. Three of the staff are residents of the Cathedral Housing Development. One of the community workers and the secretary are Spanish speaking.

UNITED SOUTH END SETTLEMENTS

JOB DESCRIPTION

PROJECT DIRECTOR - CATHEDRAL SECURITY PROGRAM

General Duties: Working as a full-time staff member of U.S E.S., the Project Director shall devote a minimum of 15% of his/her time to Cathedral Security Program responsibilities. The Project Director shall have overall supervision of the program and the staff hired to carry out the specific functions. The Project Director shall have the final responsibility to ascertain that contractual obligations with the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice are fulfilled and that progress reports which reflect the quality and quantity of the work done are submitted on a regular basis to the Grantor agency.
Specific Duties:

1. Screening, selection and recommend for the hiring of the Project Coordinator. (The Executive Director of U.S.E.S. shall have the final determination on this selection).

2. Provide on-going supervision in regularly scheduled conferences with the Project Coordinator.

3. Translate overall objectives and contractual obligations into specific work plans and ascertain that adequate staff is hired to implement such work plans.

4. Assist the Project Coordinator in the selection of staff and make the final recommendation to hire to the Executive Director of U.S.E.S.

5. Write the proposals for continued funding of the program.

6. Supervise the writing of the reports required by the agency and the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice to document qualitatively and quantitatively that contractual obligation are met.

7. Provide a liaison function with other component parts of U.S.E.S.

8. Maintain direct working relationships with the Tenant's Task Force, Tenant leadership and Management.

9. Be available to the Project Coordinator for consultation and in general assist in the smooth administrative functioning of the program.
10. Conduct public information services which will help interpret the program to residents of the Cathedral Development, agencies and institutions serving the Development and the community at large. This will include the publications of newsletters, video tape training, newspaper releases etc.

11. Participate in staff meetings and regular conferences with staff. Provide creative input into such meetings.

12. Participate in evaluation conferences with staff around job performance upon completion of probationary period and on an annual basis thereafter.

UNITED SOUTH END SETTLEMENTS

JOB DESCRIPTION

PROJECT COORDINATOR - CATHEDRAL SECURITY PROGRAM

General Duties: Working as a full-time staff member of the U.S.E.S.' Cathedral Community Security Program. The Project Coordinator shall have the responsibility to coordinate and supervise the day-to-day staff activities of the program. The coordinator will be responsible for the successful implementation of the specific staff assignments and delegate the implementation of the program's work plans to specific staff.

As coordinator of the program he/she has a major responsibility in knowing the people of the area, its services and institutions. The Project Coordinator shall be responsible to the Project Director in carrying out his/her responsibilities.
Specific Duties:

1. Recruit, screen and recommend to hire the staff needed to implement the program.

2. Delegate specific responsibilities to program staff, supervise the successful implementation of such staff duties through regularly scheduled individual conferences and staff meetings.

3. Conduct regular staff meetings with program staff and solicit their creative participation in the solution of security problems.

4. Develop written evaluations of staff performance, share these with staff and subsequently with Project Director.

5. Write or supervise the writing of performance reports which reflect qualitatively as well as quantitatively how well contractual obligations are being met. Relate reports and data to specific program objectives.

6. Staff a Monitoring Committee.

7. Develop a research - evaluation component to measure to the success or failure of the program.

8. Encourage staff and residents to find new and creative resolutions to the security problems of Cathedral.

9. Maintain on-going communication and effective working relationships with tenants leadership, other U.S.E.S. program components - specifically those working within
Cathedral, other agencies and institutions, specifically the Boston Police Dpt., BHA Management, the courts and other component parts of the Criminal Justice System and The Grantor Agency.

10. Implement the personnel policies of U.S.E.S. in the supervision of the staff and the smooth administrative functioning of the program.

UNITED SOUTH END SETTLEMENTS

JOB DESCRIPTION

COMMUNITY WORKER - CATHEDRAL SECURITY PROGRAM

General Duties: Working as staff members of the U.S.E.S.' Cathedral Community Security Program Community Workers shall have the responsibility to help improve the educational interaction and communication with families within the Cathedral Project through the development of leadership training, establishment of community activities which will involve Cathedral residents in the collective resolution of security problems, and in general promote those self-help activities which will help to make the Cathedral Project a better place in which to live. The Community Workers have the responsibility to know the people of area and the community institutions. They will be responsible to interpret the services of U.S.E.S. and specifically the services rendered under contract with the Mayor's Office Of Criminal Justice to Cathedral residents.

Specific Duties:

1. Reach out aggressively to residents within the
Cathedral Development to identify and cultivate leadership among tenants.

2. Convene meetings and give staff support to tenant councils, building groups or any other collective problem solving body within the Development.

3. Develop specific media for improved community interaction, such as a community newsletter, video tape programs, or other communications programs through which participants can learn new skills.

4. Maintain records and reports required by U.S.E.S., the Mayor's Office Of Criminal Justice, as well as any other records necessary to reflect quality and quantity of services rendered.

5. Participate in staff meetings, in-service-training sessions, conferences or other meetings required to keep up-to-date on information about U.S.E.S., the community or developments which affect the Cathedral Project or its residents.


7. Carry out assigned duties as instructed by the Project Coordinator.

SECRETARY

Responsibilities as secretary will include reception in security office. Typing and correction of all information, notes and reports related to security project and related programs. Responsible for environment of security office.
APPENDIX #10
CATHEDRAL PROJECT—PROPOSED CHANGES FOR 617 HARRISON AVENUE

617 Harrison Avenue
Management Office
Beam

Management's Entrance (A)

Proposed New Wall & Emergency Exit (E)

Residents' Entrance (B)

Mailbox Area

Elevator

Elevator

Stairs
APPENDIX #11
INCIDENT REPORT QUESTIONS

1. Have any of the things listed here (hand them crime descriptions) happened to you, or someone you know in this project in the past year or so?

A
Has happened
Within Five
Year

B
Within
Past
Year

C
Most
Frightening

D
Most
Likely

E
Happened
to Friend
or Acquain-
tance

a. Arson
b. Assault
c. Burglary
d. Car Theft
e. Forgery/Fraud
f. Larceny
g. Malicious Mischief
h. Rape/Child Molesting
j. Robbery
k. Other (specify)
l. None of these

2. Which one crime on that list is the most frightening one to you, personally— the one you'd least like to have happen to you or someone in your family?

3. Of course, no one likes to think about being victimized, but sometimes it happens. I'd like you to tell me which one of the crimes on that list might be most likely to have to you here in this project?

4. I'd like to ask you some details about the things you said happened to you. The last time it happened did it occur:

   In the project or grounds

   Within a few blocks around the project

   Away from the project in Boston

   Out of Boston
5. Where exactly did this happen?

- Inside own apartment
- In another apt. in this project #
- In hallway of own building
- In hallway of another building
- In parking lot
- On grounds of project
- Somewhere else in this project

6. Did it happen during:

- Daytime
- Nighttime
- Don't know

7. Did you or someone else let the police know about this or didn't they happen to be told about it?

- Yes, were told
- No, were not told (If checked, skip to #9)
- Don't remember

8. How long did it take them to come?

- 0-10 minutes
- 11-30 minutes
- 30 minutes to an hour
- One hour to 2 hours
- More than 2 hours
- Never came

9. Why didn't you call or let them know about it?

- Fear of retaliation
- Don't like the police
- Police couldn't do anything
- Concern for the offender
- Other (specify)
0. Was the crime committed by only one, or more than one person?

Only one person
Don't Know
More than one

If only one person:
1. Was the Person
   Male
   Female

2. How old would you say the Person was? Was he/she
   Under 12
   12-16
   17-20
   21-30
   Over 30

3. Was he/she:
   White
   Spanish
   Black
   Something else

4. Was the person:
   Someone you recognized
   Had never seen before

5. Was the person a relative of yours?
   Yes
   No
   Never saw before
   Don't know for sure
   Recognized

6. More than One:
   Were they
   Male
   Female
   Both

11. Were they
   Male
   Female
   Both

12. Would you say the youngest person was:
   Under 12
   12-16
   17-20
   21-30
   Over 30

13. Were they:
   Only white
   Only Spanish
   Only Black
   White, Black or some other Combination
   (Specify)

14. Did you:
   Recognize any of the persons
   Had you ever seen any of them before

15. Were any of them relatives of yours?
   Yes
   No
   Never saw before
   Don't know for sure
   Recognized

INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWER: Repeat all questions on this page until the number of incident report forms completed equal the number of incidents in question #1.
6. Some people say they don't tell the police when they see a crime committed because they're afraid someone will find out they reported it and will get back at them. Do you think anyone would get back at you if you reported a crime committed by young kids in this project?

   Yes       
   No        
   Don't know   

7. What do you think they would do to you?

8. Do you think anyone would get back at you if you reported a crime committed by adults in this project.

   Yes       
   No        
   Don't know   

9. What do you thing they would do to you?

10. Let's imagine that it would be possible to pay some tenants to help patrol the project for crime and report back what they saw to the police, do you think this would cut down on crime?

   Cut down alot       
   Cut down somewhat    
   Wouldn't make any difference   
# Appendix #12
## Personal Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/10/76</td>
<td>Ramona Anderson</td>
<td>Director, Cathedral Security Program, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/77</td>
<td>Ruth Barkley</td>
<td>President, Cathedral Tenant Council, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/77</td>
<td>Milton Cole</td>
<td>Director of Security, Bromley-Heath Project, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/76</td>
<td>Corale Everteze</td>
<td>President, Tenant Council, Roosevelt Towers, Public Housing Project, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/76</td>
<td>Leo Gullinello</td>
<td>Director of Security, BHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7/77</td>
<td>Ronda Johnson</td>
<td>Member, Cathedral Tenant Council, Boston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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