

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

1. TYPE OF ACTION
[] PREAPPLICATION
[X] APPLICATION
[] NOTIFICATION OF INTENT (Opt)
[] REPORT OF FEDERAL ACTION

2. APPLICANT'S APPLICATION
Leave Blank

a. NUMBER
b. DATE Year month day
19

3. STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER

a. NUMBER
b. DATE Year month day
ASSIGNED 19

4. LEGAL APPLICANT/RECIPIENT
a. Applicant Name : Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
b. Organization Unit : Local Municipality Consortium
c. Street/P.O. Box : 5 Washington Street
d. City : Haverhill
e. County : Essex
f. State : MA
g. ZIP Code: 01830
h. Contact Person (Name & telephone No.) : Raymond G. Wilson

5. FEDERAL EMPLOYER
04 232

6. PROJECT CATEGORY
[] 0 [] 1
Discretionary (B)

COURTESY COPY
(Basic program narrative only)

7. TITLE AND DESCRIPTION OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT
"Target Entry"
A crime prevention program targeted against the entry crimes of vandalism, burglary, auto-theft, and shoplifting; involving an RPU, County & Municipal Government, Neighborhoods, Realtors, Chambers of Commerce, and other businesses.

8. APPLICANT/RECIPIENT
B-Interstate
C-Substate
D-District
E-City
F-School District
G-Special Purpose District
H-Community Action Agency
I-Higher Educational Institution
J-Indian Tribe
K-Other (Specify):
Enter appropriate letter [E]

9. TYPE OF ASSISTANCE
A-Basic Grant
B-Supplemental Grant
C-Loan
D-Insurance
E-Other
Enter appropriate letter(s) [A]

10. AREA OF PROJECT IMPACT (Names of cities, counties, States, etc.)
Essex County; and Suffolk County except for Boston (the "Essex Region")

11. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS BENEFITING
750,000

12. TYPE OF APPLICATION
A-New
B-Renewal
C-Revision
D-Continuation
E-Augmentation
Enter appropriate letter [A]

13. PROPOSED FUNDING
Table with columns: a. FEDERAL, b. APPLICANT, c. STATE, d. LOCAL, e. OTHER, f. TOTAL

14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF:
Table with columns: a. APPLICANT, b. PROJECT, 16. PROJECT START DATE, 17. PROJECT DURATION, 18. ESTIMATED DATE TO BE SUBMITTED TO FEDERAL AGENCY

15. TYPE OF CHANGE (For 12c or 12e)
A-Increase Dollars
B-Decrease Dollars
C-Increase Duration
D-Decrease Duration
E-Cancellation
F-Other (Specify):
N/A
Enter appropriate letter(s) [] [] []

20. FEDERAL AGENCY TO RECEIVE REQUEST (Name, City, State, ZIP code)
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C.

21. REMARKS ADDED
[X] Yes [] No

22. THE APPLICANT CERTIFIES THAT
a. To the best of my knowledge and belief, data in this preapplication/application are true and correct...

b. If required by OMB Circular A-95 this application was submitted, pursuant to instructions therein, to appropriate clearinghouses and all responses are attached:
(1) Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
(2) Metropolitan Area Planning Council
(3) State Clearinghouse

23. CERTIFYING REPRESENTATIVE
a. TYPED NAME AND TITLE
Joseph S. D'Orazio, Chairman

b. SIGNATURE

c. DATE SIGNED
1979 MAR 15

24. AGENCY NAME

25. APPLICATION RECEIVED
19

26. ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT

27. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

28. FEDERAL APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION

29. ADDRESS

30. FEDERAL GRANT IDENTIFICATION

31. ACTION TAKEN
Table with columns: a. AWARDED, b. REJECTED, c. RETURNED FOR AMENDMENT, d. DEFERRED, e. WITHDRAWN

32. FUNDING
Table with columns: a. FEDERAL, b. APPLICANT, c. STATE, d. LOCAL, e. OTHER, f. TOTAL

33. ACTION DATE
19

34. STARTING DATE
19

35. CONTACT FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (Name and telephone number)

36. ENDING DATE
19

37. REMARKS ADDED
[] Yes [] No

38. FEDERAL AGENCY A-95 ACTION
a. In taking above action, any comments received from clearinghouses were considered. If agency response is due under provisions of Part 1, OMB Circular A-95, it has been or is being made.

b. FEDERAL AGENCY A-95 OFFICIAL (Name and telephone no.)

SECTION I - APPLICANT/RECIPIENT DATA

SECTION II - CERTIFICATION

SECTION III - FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION

TARGET ENTRY

1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR THIS ASSISTANCE

"TARGET ENTRY" is targeted at the entry crimes of Vandalism, Breaking and Entering, Shoplifting, and Auto Theft. These crimes have been selected because they are deemed to be the "doors" through which large numbers of juveniles embark upon criminal careers. They are believed to be crimes which can be reduced by appropriate innovative operations; and it is further believed that by reducing the success rate in the commission of these crimes, we will be reducing long-term overall crime rates. These crimes are the central target of this project, but NOT the only target. They are a focal point for its operation, providing an achievable, measurable objective for project participants over a long range. This provides a consistent setting for the development of strategies and structures which will likely be as effective in dealing with other critical crimes (eg. rape, assaults on the elderly) which, though severe, may be relatively short-term in a given location.

While the major objective of Target Entry is the reduction of certain crimes and the consequent impact upon juvenile criminal motivation, this project also addresses a second distinct set of objectives related to developing solutions to problems experienced in implementing and institutionalizing crime prevention operations. Specifically, the growth and acceptance of crime prevention techniques in this country have been slow and "spotty" in spite of remarkable success stories where such techniques have been properly implemented. While all the "pieces seem to be there" (i.e., the technology), there has been a problem in "getting it all together", in bringing together criminal justice components, other government agencies, businesses, community groups, and private citizens in a coordinated effort.

As pointed out in the Discretionary Grant Guidelines (M4500.1G) a number of agencies and organizations have initiated campaigns and programs, to see them "meet with only limited success". Locally, the Chambers of Commerce, the Lions, the Boards of Realtors, and others have been involved in varying levels of crime prevention efforts in recent years, responding to a very obvious public need; but none of these groups has individually had the resources or the public position to command the comprehensive, consistent, and sustained effort the problem requires.

At the same time, even law enforcement agencies' efforts to begin implementing crime prevention strategies have been impeded by existing structures (or the lack of them) and traditions. When the Essex County Sheriff examined the feasibility of implementing the National Sheriff's Association Neighborhood Watch Program, he soon determined that the necessary links between his Department and the neighborhoods were not sufficient (even working with local police) to insure even a proper distribution of materials. The earliest local experiments with modern crime prevention techniques were in the mid-sixties when a Lawrence Police Captain designed a neighborhood watch plan which captured the imagination of the local newspaper and a few citizens; but it all never got beyond the plan stage. Almost a decade later,

the Lawrence Police Department again tried to implement city-wide neighborhood watch programs, this time building upon publicized successes in other parts of the country. There were neighborhood meetings, but interest did not hold up long and the effort was terminated.

Missing in these efforts was in-depth technical expertise in total crime prevention strategy at both operational and planning levels. Until late 1978, no area police department had trained Crime Prevention Officers (CPOs). After Lawrence did obtain a trained CPO in late 1978, a neighborhood watch program was successfully established in one of its troubled sections. Furthermore, recent statistics indicate a substantial decrease in this section's proportion of burglary in the City.

That burglary decrease in the neighborhood watch section of the City highlights another problem. Burglary in the total City did NOT decrease, indicating that neighborhood burglaries were merely DISPLACED to other sectors. True reductions (rather than displacements) will only be brought about by City-wide and area-wide crime prevention programs, more than a single CPO working by himself can handle. Operations management problems arise as multiple meetings and directed tactical operations may be occurring in different neighborhoods at the same time. Rapid statistical analysis capabilities are needed to determine where operations are needed, not only complicated by geographic displacement, but by crime-type displacement (offenders may not only switch to other geographic areas, but to other types of crimes). Add to these problems the dimension that criminals are not likely to respect municipal boundaries in their movements.

The financial and manpower resources to cope with these problems actually probably ARE within the community, considering the recognized stake that both individuals and organizations have in crime reduction; but to expect a CPO to harness those resources while addressing the complex set of other problems listed, when those organizations themselves have even tried and failed, is not realistic.

To expect the CPO to develop a program encompassing all these problems is working "inside out". Needed is an overall program, encompassing all resources and coordination components needed by the CPO, and within which he can operate. Ideally, what is needed is a working model, an existing comprehensive program in an area that is not so complex that intricate facets and effects cannot be fairly observed; preferably, it is compact, yet contains multiple jurisdictions, high and low population density neighborhoods, urban areas, suburbs, and industry.

In sum, what is needed is a WORKING CRIME PREVENTION MODEL which:

- involves business, neighborhoods, and a variety of government agencies in a common, coordinated, sophisticated and specific crime reduction effort;
- operates in a compact and relatively isolated "mini-metropolis", an "urban laboratory" which facilitates control, demonstration, and measurement;

- provides vehicles for the transfer of successful strategies to other area localities and throughout the Country;
- provides guidelines for adapting its strategies to counter crimes other than those with which it specifically deals and to productively involve businesses and professions other than those currently cooperating.

Thus, the specific OBJECTIVES of TARGET ENTRY are:

- (a) to substantially reduce the level of vandalism, burglary, auto-theft, and shoplifting in target areas;
- (b) to effectively and demonstrably impact crime activity other than the four "Target Crimes" when project resources are applicable;
- (c) to establish a durable commitment within the various community sectors to actively and financially support crime prevention programs (i.e., to institutionalize successful strategies); and
- (d) to develop a field-tested, ready-to-use, comprehensive crime prevention package for adoption by other areas, to include:
 - manuals covering every phase of organization, operations, and strategy;
 - samples of public information material for printing;
 - audio-visual programs (slides & standard audio cassette, synchronized) directed at
 - public awareness;
 - specific training for both general public and program participants; and
 - open solicitation for both financial and participative support.