

<b>POLICY PROPOSAL:</b>	Police Shared Services Agreement
<b>MUNICIPALITY:</b>	Borough of Mt. Arlington
<b>POLICY CONSULTANTS</b>	Coleen M. Cusack, J.D.
	Luis Martinez, M.Ed.
<b>DATE OF REVIEW:</b>	October 18, 2007

## **POLICE SHARED SERVICES AGREEMENT: A POLICY PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

Consolidating police services, in a quest for improved services at similar or lower costs, has been debated in policing circles and has been the holy grail of law enforcement since organized policing has been around. There are approximately 17,000 police agencies in the United States and, although some areas have consolidated with a result of improved services, the concept has never gained wide support and there are many pitfalls that must be avoided.

The primary concern any community should embrace and this should always be at the top of any list and before cost comes to play, is the why of consolidation and the local control the community will be exchanging for a hope of better, or cheaper, policing. There is a sense of independence that a city or town must yield to another governing body when consolidating, this relinquishing of control may not sit well with the community once they realize their wishes are now secondary to a government not their own.

A secondary concern, as important as the lack of local control, should always be the financial impact of the consolidation and the contractual obligations the community will be forced to make to a third party, without any real guarantees to the level of police service the community will receive. It is tempting, and naturally so, for advocates of consolidation to minimize the real cost, including hidden and variables, of committing to a contract. It is also important for the community seeking consolidation to understand that the higher cost of consolidation includes additional police services that the community may not need, or if so, the need is so rare it is best left to a county-level or state police agency to provide these ancillary services as mandated by law, if the legal obligation exists.

In many states, the police agency at the state level is mandated by law to provide investigative and logistical support services to smaller agencies; these services are not paid for by the local agency. Smaller law enforcement agencies generally do not have the criminal investigative expertise or resources to handle a complex financial investigation. In such cases, the state law enforcement agency will assist with the investigation. Few police departments have a crime lab and that service is generally provided at the state level; the cost is included in the agency's budget as mandated by legislation. State police agencies also provide tactical support (SWAT teams) when

needed as smaller agencies do not have the manpower and resources to fund these tactical units. Since these instances are few, there is no need for a small local agency to fund large detective units or tactical teams. These are but two examples of careful considerations local government must give the consolidation of police services; why pay for a function the agency will only rarely need.

Consolidation of police services is a drastic step and must be taken cautiously and only after complete, thorough research. Many times the proponents of consolidation will avoid or ignore the negative consequences: a) senior, supervisory, and line officers alike may be threatened by consolidation and aggressively resist change; b) consolidation is likely to increase costs, particularly because of the start-up costs of reorganization, planning, and standardizing equipment, and possible need for a new building to house the combined agencies; and c) officers in line for promotion or advanced assignment in one agency may find they are outranked for these opportunities by their peers in the other agency.

Once consolidation has occurred, the governing process may well mean: a) loss of control by smaller communities; b) confusion about how and where complaints are sent; c) loss of personal interaction with local law enforcement; and d) fragmented oversight of the newly combined law enforcement agency by local community councils and mayors.<sup>1</sup>

## **HISTORY, BACKGROUND and STAKEHOLDER'S OPINIONS:**

On or about March 21, 2007 the Mt. Arlington Fraternal Order of Police ("FOP") Lodge #78 delivered a letter to the mayor and council to put them on notice concerning the danger created by "lack of adequate police staffing and road coverage." The letter, as summarized and re-printed in the Roxbury Register, continued:

*"As you are aware, back in 1980, the Mount Arlington Police Department consisted of 10 full-time officers. Some 26 years later, even though the population of the borough has significantly increased, we only have 13 police officers in the department. Clearly, the maintenance of the department and the safety of the borough could be compromised by the police department being so woefully understaffed," Wargo said.*

*"The officers of this department have endeavored to keep the borough safe and secure, despite the lack of personnel," he said.*

*"The borough has continually provided excellent service, but at our current levels of staffing, the police department is stretching itself too thin. Clearly, the officers of this department are concerned for their safety and the safety of all citizens of the borough," the letter states.*

---

<sup>1</sup> International Association of Chiefs of Police (2003, May). *Consolidating police services- An IACP planning approach*. Retrieved on October 17, 2007 from: <http://www.theiacp.org/research/ConsolidatingPoliceServicesIACPPlanningApproach.pdf>

*“Understaffing could compromise the integrity of the department and lead to a lack of service that could and should be provided to the community. Unfortunately, we live in a world that is more violent and unpredictable than the world we all lived in some 26 years ago, and the staffing of the department has not matched these changing times,” Wargo wrote.*

*Wargo went on to say that the officers feel that their safety is compromised when, more times than not, they are working alone for long periods of time.*

*“It is impractical and irresponsible in this day and age to have officers working alone and covering three square miles (the borough’s size) all by themselves,” Wargo wrote.*

#### *No Overtime*

*“As you are aware, the department has attempted to maximize shift coverage with the current staff available to address the problem. However, even this procedure is undercut by the fact that if someone calls out sick or is otherwise unable to work for a shift, the person is not replaced. The department will not cover shifts with overtime and the officers are again left alone to work by themselves,” Wargo told the mayor and council.*

*“The officers of this department want to put the borough on notice of its immediate concern regarding staffing and shift coverage. It has been the goal of this department to serve the citizens with quality and efficiency, but the current levels of staffing undermine our efforts,” the letter states.*

#### *'Reinforcement'*

*“Additionally, an officer who is out on the road on their own is exposed to a danger that could be minimized with proper staffing and shift coverage. We urge the Borough Council to explore reinforcing our department before a tragedy, which could have been prevented by proper staffing, occurs,” Wargo wrote.*

*“Please remember that the best interests of the borough are best served by the maintenance of a fully staffed department,” the letter concludes.<sup>2</sup>*

On May 27, 2007, the Borough of Mt. Arlington, through its mayor and council, by resolutions 2007-79 and 2007-80, awarded a professional services contract or contracts to Blue Shield Consultants (“BSC”).<sup>3</sup> The resolution and professional services contract specified the following purposes and terms:

---

<sup>2</sup> (2007, March 21). Roxbury Register.

<sup>3</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007, May 24). Council Meeting Minutes. Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: <http://www.ci.mount-arlington.nj.us/council/052407minutes.pdf>

**WHEREAS**, one of the most effective measures to reduce local property taxes is through regionalization, consolidation or sharing of services by Counties, Municipalities and School Districts; and

**WHEREAS**, the Borough of Mount Arlington is desirous of securing the services of a consultant to assist in studying the possibility of a “Shared Services Agreement” for its Police Department and Municipal Court; and

**WHEREAS**, Blue Shield Consulting Services (the “Consultant”) has demonstrated a unique past successful history of studying, evaluating and implementing shared police services contracts; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Mount Arlington wish to enter into an agreement with Blue Shield Consulting Services for the study and evaluation of Police and Municipal Court services; and

**WHEREAS**, the study and evaluation will include reviewing of the feasibility of contracting for police services with the Townships of Jefferson and Roxbury as well as the Borough of Wharton; and

**WHEREAS**, after completion of the study a written recommendation will be presented to the Mayor and Borough Council and a proposed “Shared Services” Contract will be submitted; and

**WHEREAS**, protection of our community is paramount and the study and evaluation will examine law enforcement agencies similar to the Borough of Mount Arlington’s Police Department.<sup>4</sup>

In June, 2007, SaveMAPD, a movement and organization to help maintain the Mt. Arlington Police Department, was established by David Rubenstein.<sup>5</sup> On June 28, 2007, a petition was circulated to save the Mt. Arlington police department.<sup>6</sup> On or about July 27, 2007, the FOP circulated a flyer advising residents, *inter alia*, that “the Mayor and Borough Council contracted Blue Shield Consulting and are considering dissolving [the] police department.”<sup>7</sup> In an email response to a citizen concern, the Mayor explained that the FOP had earlier approached the Mayor and Borough Council about concerns that the staffing levels of the Mt. Arlington Police Department (“MAPD”) created potential safety issues for both the residents of the community as well as the

---

<sup>4</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007). Resolution 2007-79. A resolution of the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Mount Arlington in the County of Morris, New Jersey, Awarding a Professional Services Contract to Blueshield Consulting Services.

<sup>5</sup> Rubenstein, D. (2007). About SaveMAPD. Retrieved on October 18, 2007 from: <http://www.savemapd.com/8.html>

<sup>6</sup> SaveMAPD.com (2007). Retrieved on October 18, 2007 from: <http://www.savemapd.com/8.html>

<sup>7</sup> Mt. Arlington Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #78. (2007, July 27). Notice to Mount Arlington Residents.

officers. As a result of these safety issues, the borough was considering relinquishing control of its police agency and allowing a nearby community to assume the protection of the community, for a fee. The Mayor assured the citizen that Mt. Arlington would “never let the level of service that we now enjoy ever be diminished.”<sup>8</sup>

A number of residents attended the Borough Council meeting held on August 13, 2007 and voiced their reservations about the proposal to disband the police force. *Jack Barber, at 657 Reba Road*, wondered why the Borough, believed to be the fastest growing town in New Jersey, would opt for no protection or for protection from an agency ten miles away.<sup>9</sup> *Richard Schumm, of 55 Ridgeview Lane*, asked how much money would be saved through the sharing of police services and how the Council intended to use that money.<sup>10</sup>

*Mr. Nolan of 144 Ridgeview Lane* expressed his concerns about police response time and how the Mayor cannot assure the residents that response time wouldn't be adversely impacted should police services be shared with a neighboring community. Mr. Nolan expressed his opinion that this current dilemma appeared to be an internal management problem or labor dispute and wanted to see a report on police activity.<sup>11</sup> *Mr. Longtime, at 16 Hover Drive*, appreciated the Mayor's attempt to save money, but had concerns about accountability and also wanted to know how much of a savings would make the proposal worthwhile.<sup>12</sup>

*Maria Cacko at 130A Schmitz Terrace* asked if the Mayor and Council “are going to guarantee our safety?”<sup>13</sup> *Bill Cacko, of the same address*, volunteered that he was a retired police officer from Newark and that, with regard to Califon, they had only two police officers and no coverage at all on weekends or holidays, so the community was, of course, happy with a shared service as they were glad to see anybody. Mr. Cacko wanted to see a study regarding police response time and wondered whether the existing officers would have the option to stay or whether they would be asked to retire.<sup>14</sup>

*Rob Slockbower, at 224 Howard Boulevard* pointed out that regardless of the conclusions of the study, the Mayor would be unable to guarantee that services and police presence wouldn't diminish or that response time wouldn't suffer. Mr. Slockbower argued that should the Borough contract with a neighboring town and, in a few years, the town suffers some budgetary setbacks, there would be nothing to prevent the town from cutting back on its police force and then the Borough would be back in the same position. Mr. Slockbower's son was a victim in an accident a few months prior on Howard Boulevard and attributes the cause to the high speed of the road. He

---

<sup>8</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007, August 13). Council Meeting Minutes. Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: <http://www.ci.mount-arlington.nj.us/council/081307minutes.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Id.

<sup>10</sup> Id.

<sup>11</sup> Id.

<sup>12</sup> Id.

<sup>13</sup> Id.

<sup>14</sup> Id.

presented a petition with 45 signatures to reduce the speed and expressed his desire to see more policemen frequent the area.<sup>15</sup>

*Heather Reinhardt, 614 Stanly Place*, asked how much of the \$1.3 million spent on the police force is reflected in the Borough taxes and how much it would cost taxpayers to add three new officers to the force.<sup>16</sup> *Pat Fisioso at 8 Ridgeview Lane* “thanked the Mt. Arlington Police Department for their assistance with his wife’s recent emergency” and voiced his concern that the department remain in the community to ensure a short response time.<sup>17</sup>

*Alma Rios from 355 Howard Boulevard* asked why the Borough can’t keep the police and why it was necessary to start from zero?<sup>18</sup> *John Mellot, 122 Ridgeview Lane*, asked how many studies Mr. Ehrenburg performed in the past and on how many occasions he recommended that the local police department be maintained? It appears that Mr. Ehrenberg indicated he had recommended, 2 or 3 times, for preservation of the existing force. As follow-up, an unnamed resident asked when this was done last and what were the factors leading to that decision or recommendation.<sup>19</sup> *Mr. Mellot* also asked how much taxes would be raised for a new officer.<sup>20</sup> *Ms. Lee Pappas of 11 Richard Drive West* commented that two things impact people in a community: the closure of a school and when they “take away” their police. Ms. Pappas reflected that taxes used to cover sewers and garbage collection, but now these are separately paid for by residents together with their water bills, which are high. Ms. Pappas wondered if the Council would put the issue to a referendum and let the people in the town vote on whether they would approve a tax increase to support the police. Ms. Pappas suggested that the residents might not be financially motivated in this instance.<sup>21</sup>

*Ms. McDonald of 5 Chestnut Street* also wanted the matter sent to the taxpayers for a vote to see whether the residents would be willing to pay the extra salary it might cost for more police. Ms. McDonald reflected that the residents “feel very safe and close” with the existing police force.<sup>22</sup> *Ed Merola of 47 West Bertrand Road* wished that, for the sake of the careers of the officers, who have been great, that the issue is brought to a quick conclusion. *Mr. Merola* also urged the Council to include the residents in the process.<sup>23</sup>

*Joe Keltos, from 551 Eric Lane*, asked if the study was implemented to address safety reasons or financial reasons and wondered if the Borough has a safety problem, presently. Mr. Keltos inquired as to whether there was an emergency fund that could be tapped into to resolve these problems in the interim, whether additional overtime would

---

<sup>15</sup> Id.  
<sup>16</sup> Id.  
<sup>17</sup> Id.  
<sup>18</sup> Id.  
<sup>19</sup> Id.  
<sup>20</sup> Id.  
<sup>21</sup> Id.  
<sup>22</sup> Id.  
<sup>23</sup> Id.

satisfy the FOP concerns, and how long there had been only one officer on the shift that gave rise to the safety concerns. Mr. Keltos wondered if the Mine Hill and Wharton communities experienced similar staff shortages prompting their decision to share services and if one officer went to the other community, whether that left a void and would Mt. Arlington be in a similar situation? Mr. Keltos questioned whether, in past mergers, the acquiring community or the disbanding community had a higher tax rate and if services are outsourced to a community with higher costs, how that could financially benefit residents of Mt. Arlington.<sup>24</sup>

*Ms. Conover from Schmitz Terrace* stated that the Mayor needed her vote when he ran for office and it was her right to vote for him. She expressed her desire to have that same right by providing a referendum regarding the Police Department.<sup>25</sup> *Mr. Lamphier, of 665 Henmar Drive* stated that it was ironic to see signs urging residents to support armed forces overseas when there is little support for those in their own community. Mr. Lamphier expressed his opinion that it appeared the decision had already been made. He went on to point out that everyone is concerned with safety and that the police department has provided the residents with loyalty commitment and pride and that is what should be considered when determining the best course of action for Mt. Arlington to take.<sup>26</sup> *Paula Danchuk of 50 Elizabeth Way* suggested that Council should have held a meeting to inform the public of its intent sooner which could have lessened the emotion and provided more facts instead of meeting only with the police. Ms. Danchuk asked if a petition could be generated to get a referendum on the police question. Ms. Danchuk asked whether Mine Hill renegotiated the financial aspects of their contract, or just extended its term.<sup>27</sup>

*Chris Kelly, at 52 Summit Avenue*, suggested that since “our children go to Roxbury High School” and since we don’t have adequate police coverage at night, whether Mt. Arlington could obtain shared services with Roxbury Police for one night with one officer.<sup>28</sup>

On or about October 4, 2007, Dave Rubenstein of “Save MAPD” engaged the services of Coleen M. Cusack and Luis Martinez for the purpose of reviewing and objectively evaluating the policy recommendations of Blue Shield Consultants.

Presently, the petition to save the Mt. Arlington Police Department has garnered 1130 signatures from residents and other interested persons.<sup>29</sup> Petitioners have an opportunity to leave comments, as well. *Deirdre Profaca* writes, “The thought of not having the Mt. Arlington Police Dept. close by, makes me feel very unsafe. Please keep the MAPD stationed exactly where they are.”

---

<sup>24</sup> Id.

<sup>25</sup> Id.

<sup>26</sup> Id.

<sup>27</sup> Id.

<sup>28</sup> Id.

<sup>29</sup> iPetitions. (2007). Save the Mt. Arlington Police Department Petition. Retrieved on October 18, 2007 from:

Another resident and signatory to the petition, *Diana Sibilis* writes:

*I think our police force is one of the best. When making a decision to disband the police force you must also take into consideration that there are many down sides to this that I am sure the report will not reflect, such as the liability that Mount Arlington will assume for the acts of the officers on the other police force. . . Perhaps the other police department's officers are not as [professional] as ours and the potential liability to our residents could be substantially increased by the acts of these officers. I believe that for the report to be extensive enough to address all of the possible issues with merging forces with another municipality you must not only take into consideration the positive effects but also the potential for negative impact on our municipality. Be very careful when making decisions to get rid of a well oiled machine.<sup>30</sup>*

William A. Montano, a resident and retired Chief of Police, offered these comments on the petition:

*In 2004, I retired as Chief of Police of the Pequannock Township Police Department after 30 years of service. I was shocked when I recently learned that Mount Arlington is considering disbanding their fine police department. While I recognize that professional policing costs money, what price do you put on public safety especially in these most trying times? Who better knows their community better than their local police officers. Law enforcement is not a job but a vocation. Officers take this job knowing the dangers, [undesirable] work schedules, public apathy, and the lack of a normal family lifestyle. They enlist because of their strong desire to make their community a better place for their fellow citizens. A neighboring police department contracting police services for Mount Arlington may provide acceptable services, but will never put the interests of a secondary community on par with their own. I hope you seriously reconsider disbanding your police department. The residents deserve better. Public safety cannot be taken lightly. Your local police department is the heart and soul of the community, and its officers dedicate their entire professional careers to make it a better and safer place. Thank you! I'm confident you will do the right thing.<sup>31</sup>*

## **QUALIFICATIONS:**

**Coleen M. Cusack** is a licensed attorney in California with a private criminal defense practice. Currently, Ms. Cusack is organizing a long-term study on the effects of video-taping trials on courtroom efficiency, juror verdicts and constitutional liberties. Ms. Cusack most recently served as Director of the Bail Project at California Western School of Law where she administered a federally funded practicum coordinated

---

<sup>30</sup> Id.

<sup>31</sup> Id.

through the mutual efforts of the San Diego County Sheriff's Department and San Diego County Superior Court.

Ms. Cusack is an adjunct instructor at California Western School of Law, a lecturer at San Diego State University and a faculty practitioner at both the University of Phoenix, and Chapman University. Ms. Cusack developed the entire criminal justice curriculum used nationally by University of Phoenix and has developed curriculum for numerous other colleges as well as high schools through contract with several different publishing companies.

In 2001, Ms. Cusack and her law partner were successful in contesting, and terminating, the San Diego Red Light Camera Photo Enforcement program. Ms. Cusack was invited to testify about the abuses of this program before the California senate privacy committee and was subsequently instrumental in the drafting of legislation to reduce such abuses. Ms. Cusack has served as a consultant for numerous police agencies, nationwide, on the topic of camera enforcement.

**Luis Martinez** is currently the Chief of Police at Central Arizona College, Arizona, serving in that capacity since July 2006. Prior to CAC, Chief Martinez retired as Chief of the Gila River (AZ) Police Department, an agency of 100 employees, after 26 years in county, municipal, tribal, and state law enforcement. Chief Martinez is an adjunct faculty member at the University of Phoenix and Central Arizona College, where he teaches various criminal justice courses, including policing theory, organizational behavior, and managing police personnel. He was instrumental in the creation and development of a new police department at Gila River, developing internal policies and procedures, providing an organizational structure, and establishing manpower and training requirements for a department of 100 employees and serving a community of nearly 20,000 residents.

During his career, Chief Martinez sat in various professional committees to develop standards of training on behalf of the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board (AZPOST) and published various technical and managerial articles in national venues. He also served in committees both to develop curriculum and ensure accreditation standards were met at Central Arizona College. Chief Martinez is an NRA Firearms instructor and holds AZPOST firearms instructor certificates in general firearms, patrol rifle, and is a police trainer, holding state certification as such. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Management from the University of Phoenix and a Masters of Education degree from Northern Arizona University.

## **DOCUMENTS REVIEWED:**

1. Analysis of Police Shared Services Agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington authored by Ted M. Ehrenburg of Blue Shield Consulting, L.L.C. and dated received October 12, 2007 by Linda DeSantis, Borough Clerk.

2. Resolution 2007-79: A Resolution of the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Mount Arlington in the County of Morris, New Jersey, Awarding a Professional Services Contract to Blue Shield Consulting Services.
3. Letter to Mayor and Borough Council authored by Mt. Arlington Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #78 and dated
4. Notice to Mount Arlington Residents authored by Mt. Arlington Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #78.
5. Borough of Mount Arlington, Council Meeting Minutes dated September 25, 2006, October 9, 2006, November 13, 2006, November 27, 2006, December 11, 2006, January 22, 2007, February 12, 2007, February 26, 2007, March 12, 2007, March 26, 2007, April 9, 2007, April 23, 2007, May 7, 2007, May 24, 2007, June 11, 2007, July 9, 2007 and August 13, 2007.
6. Save the Mt. Arlington Police Department Petition
7. Various sources of data and statistics, as referenced throughout.
8. Scholarly and peer-reviewed publications, as referenced throughout.

## **ISSUES PRESENTED:**

1. Will the safety concerns of Mt. Arlington residents be better served by the existing police agency or through a shared services agreement(s) with a neighboring community?
2. Can the safety concerns of Mt. Arlington police officers be adequately satisfied within the existing agency or would a shared services agreement(s) with a neighboring community offer more protection?
3. Would maintaining the existing police agency be more cost effective than entering into a shared services agreement with a neighboring community?

## **BRIEF ANSWERS:**

1. Yes. The existing police agency appears to adequately meet the safety needs of its residents and the proposed shared services agreement(s) do/does not appear to meet or exceed this present level of service. Transferring police services to a neighboring community could result in a decreased level of service and safety to the community.
2. Unknown at this time. While it is unclear whether the existing agency can adequately satisfy the safety concerns of the FOP, the proposed shared services agreement(s) do/does not appear to adequately address issues of officer safety. Other alternatives should be explored.
3. Unknown at this time. Additional data is needed to determine the cost-effectiveness of entering into a shared services agreement with a neighboring community.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### **1. Safety of Residents:**

The BSC analysis references the safety of residents in a generalized fashion, without reference to issues of crime prevention or other safety concerns. The report does not identify what the safety concerns of the residents are, nor does it address how a shared services agreement will achieve these undefined concerns more so than the existing agency.

What is meant by public safety? In the context of the criminal justice system, it refers to both crime prevention and crime amelioration. Law abiding residents of all communities would prefer that there were fewer crimes and that the police were more effective in solving cases and incapacitating the criminals who do commit crimes.

Thus, before we can evaluate whether public safety can be improved upon through a shared services agreement, it is first necessary to identify and evaluate current effectiveness. The BSC fails to reference current crime statistics in this regard. Tables 1 and 2, appended hereto, chart the crime statistics applicable to Mt. Arlington and to the other city and townships being considered to subsume police operations.

As a small community, Mt. Arlington enjoys a concomitant small crime rate. Only four violent offenses, all of them aggravated assault, occurred in 2006. (Table 2.) With only one violent crime occurring, on average, every three months, violent crime prevention strategies of the instant department appear to be effective and leave little room for improvement.

In order to compare the crime rate to the neighboring communities, the rate is converted and expressed in per capita terms, per 100,000 residents. (See Table 1.) Expressed in this fashion, Mt. Arlington, at a rate of 75 violent crimes per 100,000 residents, enjoys a lower crime rate than that of Roxbury township. While Jefferson Township and the blended Wharton Borough police department which also provides service to Mine Hill Township seemingly have lower per-capita violent crime rates, at 65 and 40 violent crimes per capita, both of these jurisdictions also have reported an instance of forcible rape and Jefferson Township has also reported many robberies. Mt. Arlington residents have endured neither forcible rape nor robberies, both of which are usually ranked as more serious than the aggravated assaults Mt. Arlington reports.

With only 52 reported property crimes in 2006; one a week on average, Mt. Arlington residents appear to enjoy relative freedom from the economic burdens of such crimes. (Table 2.) When expressed in comparative terms, Mt. Arlington's property crime rate, per capita, is significantly lower than that of its neighbors. Mt. Arlington's property crime rate, per capita, is 975, while Jefferson Township is 1073, Roxbury Township is 1336 and the blended communities of Wharton and Mine Hill report a property crime rate of 1544 per 100,000 residents. (Table 1.) It is difficult to comprehend how allowing these neighboring jurisdictions, with higher crime rates, to

subsume responsibilities would, in any manner, result in a further reduction of Mt. Arlington's already low rate.

As the BSC report neglects to even mention the crime rate of Mt. Arlington or the neighboring communities and fails to adequately specify the safety concerns of Mt. Arlington, it follows that the report also fails to evaluate if and how the proposed policy will address those concerns. Crime prevention strategies take many forms. The BSC seems to rely, exclusively, on the patrol function of policing as the sole provider of community safety. This is a short-sighted, and flawed, analysis.

For example, situational crime control policy entails strategies such as strengthening targets (locking doors, installing alarms), increasing visibility (increasing lighting, trimming foliage), removing the target (removing valuables from car parked in public) and identifying the target (marking the valuable with a name or number for future identification and retrieval). Community policing challenges the community and other supporting agencies to work together with the police in order to resolve crime issues. Broken Windows Theory supposes that crime happens in depressed areas and cleaning up the appearance of those areas, together with Zero Tolerance policing strategies, where minor crimes are enforced without exception, can, at a minimum, displace crime to other, more depressed and unattended areas. Disappointingly, the BSC report does not address any of these crime prevention strategies.

In relying exclusively on the patrol function to prevent crime, the BSC ignores established research and findings from over three decades ago that discounts such reliance as the sole deterrent to crime. The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment set out to prove or disprove the widely held belief that a visible police presence deters crime. In this experiment, the city was divided into three different groups of Patrol beats. Proactive beats received two or three times the normal level of patrol. Reactive beats received no routine patrol, but police cars would still enter these areas in response to a call for service by a resident. In the Control beats, the normal level of patrol was maintained. "The Kansas City experiment found that the level of patrol had no effect on either crime or citizen perceptions and fear of crime."<sup>32</sup> Crime did not increase where there was less patrol nor did it decrease with more patrol.

This is not to suggest that there is no value in patrol. In the reactive patrol beats, residents likely experienced the "phantom effect" in which they saw patrol cars in other areas or they saw patrol cars responding to calls and assumed the police were actively patrolling the area.<sup>33</sup>

In a similar study which examined foot patrol in nearby Newark, NJ, increasing or decreasing foot patrol was found to have no direct correlation to the crime rate. However, increased foot patrol was found to reduce citizen's fear of crime and also

---

<sup>32</sup> Walker, S. (2006). Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth / Thomson, p. 90.

<sup>33</sup> Id.

helped to improve attitudes toward the police department.<sup>34</sup> These findings dovetail nicely with the relative success enjoyed by Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) crime-fighting program which will be discussed in further detail when the issue of staffing is explored, below.

What these studies show is that an increase in current patrol levels will not be likely to increase the actual “safety” of the community, though an increase in foot patrol could have a benefit in improving public perception in this regard. There is no discussion in the BSC report as to whether, under the proposed shared services agreements, patrol would increase, decrease or remain the same, whether it would be restructured in any fashion, whether additional preventive or reactive strategies would be employed, and whether such changes, if any, would have any impact on actual safety or the perception of security.

The corollary to the crime prevention aspect to public safety is the amelioration of crime. These are the methods the criminal justice system finds successful in detecting crime, apprehending offenders and holding these offenders accountable. While there are some proven strategies to ameliorate crime, these are all unexplored in the BSC analysis. Instead, the BSC analysis offers unsupported conclusions predicated on false assumptions. The unwritten and implied argument of the BSC is that there is a direct correlation between public safety and variables such as officer staffing rates, officer response time and detective clearance rates. These assumptions, though faulty, are generally understandable amongst those who are outside the criminal justice system and who have no practical knowledge of its inner workings. Their inclusion in the BSC study indicates either a lack of such basic understanding or a biased attempt to mislead policy makers to achieve a desired outcome.

#### *A. Staffing Rates:*

When comparing officer staffing between jurisdictions, it is typically expressed as the number of officers per 1000 residents. In 2004, there were 836,787 sworn officers employed full-time.<sup>35</sup> This translates, to the population as a whole, to 2.8 officers per 1,000 residents based on projected population estimates.<sup>36</sup> The BCS declares a national “recommendation” of 2.6. This discrepancy is difficult to reconcile as the BSC does not cite the year and source for its data.

---

<sup>34</sup> Id.

<sup>35</sup> Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2004). Law Enforcement Statistics. Summary Findings. Retrieved on October 15, 2007 from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/lawenf.htm>

<sup>36</sup> Based on projected population estimates for 2004 from the U.S. Census Bureau. (2007). United States - - States; and Puerto Rico. GCT-T1. Population Estimates. Data Set: 2006 Population Estimates. Retrieved on October 15, 2007 from: [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=01000US&-box\\_head\\_nbr=GCT-T1&-ds\\_name=PEP\\_2006\\_EST&-lang=en&-format=US-9&-sse=on](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-box_head_nbr=GCT-T1&-ds_name=PEP_2006_EST&-lang=en&-format=US-9&-sse=on)

In New Jersey, there are 2.48 sworn officers for every 1000 state residents.<sup>37</sup> This closely approximates the average expressed as a “state recommendation” by the BSC of 2.4 per 1000 residents. While these numbers are averages and averages can provide useful starting points for comparison, to refer to either of these rates as “recommendations,” is ignoble. There are a variety of different types of agencies in the United States serving different sized populations, each with different needs and policing strategies. To claim the average size of the police force should be a “recommendation” for others to follow would ignore the reality that approximately half of the agencies would fall below this average, but this does not necessarily make them deficient. Similarly, the other half of the agencies that fall above this average are not necessarily employing too many officers. Two officers per thousand in Nowhere County, Montana, is not the same as two officers per thousand in Detroit.

Even were we to agree upon a numerical formula that could be applied in this situation, we are faced with the quandary of deciding which figure should be applied as the representative population of Mt. Arlington. The BSC relies upon the 2000 census for its population data. To assess current staffing needs, however, it would make more sense to use more recent population data or projections. Thus, Table 1 compares three separate population figures: the 2000 census data relied upon by BSC, the 2006 population data reported by the FBI in the Uniform Crime Reports crime rates and the projected population data estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Should the Borough of Mt. Arlington elect to enter into a shared services agreement for police services, it might be prudent to factor in the projected growth to allow for the proportionate hiring of additional officers should the size of the population increase. Thus, future population projections over the course of the contract should be considered.

With respect to Mt. Arlington and each of the neighboring communities being considered for the proposed shared services agreement, Table 1 computes the NJ average at 2.4 per 1000 residents as against all three population sets, the National average stated by BSC at 2.6 per 1000 residents as against all three population sets and the National average as revealed above pursuant to 2004 data, at 2.8 per 1000 residents. The resulting figures show that the current staffing for Mt. Arlington falls right in the middle of the range of average computations, plus or minus 3 officers. All other jurisdictions, however, are presently understaffed: Roxbury Township (9 – 18 officers needed), Jefferson Township (8 – 22 officers needed), Wharton Borough (3 – 6 officers needed).

These apparent deficiencies in staffing of the neighboring communities must be taken into consideration when determining the prudence of outsourcing the police services of Mt. Arlington. The BSC indicates that if chosen to share services, Roxbury would add six officers, Jefferson would add six officers and Wharton would add ten officers. Employing any of these options would result in fewer officers per 1000 residents once populations were combined. It is difficult to understand how this fact, on

---

<sup>37</sup> Id.

its face, would relate in increased public safety for the residents of Mt. Arlington. Mt. Arlington currently has 8 patrol officers. That Roxbury and Jefferson would only add six officers to its existing force would suggest that Mt. Arlington was losing two patrol officers in addition to its five supervisors. Unless Roxbury and Jefferson have extra patrol officers whose services are not being fully utilized at the present, it is difficult how to conceptualize how an understaffed community can subsume another allegedly understaffed community with fewer officers and yet have equal or greater coverage.

While Wharton / Mine Hill offered to keep 10 officers, the BSC report indicates that this higher number was contemplated as the department is smaller and cannot adequately cover shortages otherwise. However, there is no discussion concerning how these officers would be assigned, relative to the existing assignments and how Wharton / Mine Hill's assumption of the patrol function would somehow improve the safety of Mt. Arlington residents. Moreover, as will be explored in greater detail in the third section of this discussion, it would cost approximately \$150,000 more to compensate the 10 officers Wharton / Mine Hill would take under its salary scheme than it presently costs to compensate the current staff of sworn personnel at Mt. Arlington. While the BSC concedes this point, it offers that there are other intangibles that support the Wharton / Mine Hill choice. These seem to be the familiarity the Wharton Borough police chief has with Mt. Arlington and the fact that Wharton / Mine Hill would continue to operate out of the existing Mt. Arlington police station. Neither of these intangibles, however, addresses issues of public safety.

Another standard for comparison of officer staffing rates would be to look at all the agencies that served a similar sized population, and the corresponding number of sworn personnel hired, on average. In 2003, there were 46,666 sworn officers employed full-time for 4,048 agencies each serving smaller populations between 2,500 and 9,999 residents.<sup>38</sup> Thus, on average, each agency serving a small population akin to Mt. Arlington hired approximately 11.53 employees. This places Mt. Arlington above the average, with 13 employees.

The BSC references an internal standard of the Mt. Arlington Police Department which would require eleven officers assigned strictly to uniformed patrol functions. Excluding the Chief of Police, a Police Lieutenant and one Detective Sergeant, that leaves only ten officers to fulfill this function. Yet the BSC fails to provide the rationale underlying this internal standard. When was this standard created? Has the department ever met this standard? Perhaps, in the interest of maintaining the force in its present capacity, this internal standard could be modified. Moreover, the Mayor and Borough Council previously conceded that they could consider adding another officer in 2008. This additional officer would help the department satisfy this internal standard.

Yet, the BSC rejects, out-of-hand, that this officer could reduce the staffing shortage problem, basing its decision on the claim that a staffing level of fourteen is the

---

<sup>38</sup> Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2004). Table 1.33.2003. Local police departments and full-time personnel by size of population served, United States, 2003. Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics online. Retrieved October 15, 2007 from: <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t1332003.pdf>

minimum required. Is this the minimum required under the NJ average? The National average? Or is this requirement simply a reference to the internal standard? In any event, the BSC does not appear to adequately understand, or even explain, the staffing problem giving rise to the current study.

The instant reviewers had to find this answer through other channels in order to adequately complete our review in a meaningful fashion. As explained in an email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein, of [www.SaveMAPD.com](http://www.SaveMAPD.com), the dangerous condition created by a single officer patrolling and which was the subject of the FOP concerns are all created by the use of vacation, personal or sick time. Thus – if all officers are working, there are no deficiencies. In the event of a staff reduction, the only hours a single officer would be patrolling alone would be between 0300 – 0600 anytime a night shift patrol officer takes off and from 0600 to noon on weekends only when an officer assigned to the weekend day shift takes off. The weekday day shift is covered due to the detective and administrative positions.<sup>39</sup> Thus, unless there are multiple requests for time off during the same shift, the maximum number of hours an additional officer would be needed in order to cover a single officer patrolling, would be 33 hours (3 hours per night x 7 nights, 6 hours per weekend day). This could be subsumed within the floating hours of a single additional sworn employee hire.

This could also be offset through the use of overtime, a practice currently employed by at least two of the jurisdictions being considered to share services: Jefferson Township and Roxbury Township. Wharton / Mine Hill might also use this to cover shortages, but the BSC report is silent on the issue. In 2006, the Mt. Arlington police department paid out 105 hours of overtime, mostly for covering shifts, but typically time shift coverage is offset through schedule adjustments. It is disappointing that the BSC report did not gather the specific overtime data from Mt. Arlington or the other agencies considered herein.

The BSC study concludes, in summary fashion, “The level of staffing at fourteen officers does not address either officer safety or citizen safety.” The BSC study fails to explain its reasoning, however, to permit the Mayor, Borough Council and residents to conclude similarly. As indicated previously, the issue of safety is summarily addressed throughout the BSC report, with no attempt to connect the dots between the causal relationship between staffing and safety.

The BSC indicates that the department has “two Patrol Sergeants, one of whom is routinely scheduled for an eleven and a half hour shift. The staffing shortage and use of supervisory personnel for patrol line functions leaves a supervisory gap where a patrol officer is alone without proper supervision.”<sup>40</sup> This is misleading and the conclusion illogical. It would be helpful to understand the overall staffing allocation. If this was understood by BSC it was not detailed in the report for consideration of those relying on the study to make an informed decision.

---

<sup>39</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>40</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 8.

As explained in an email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein, of [www.SaveMAPD.com](http://www.SaveMAPD.com), the schedule is four (4) patrol officers on and four (4) patrol officers off, all of whom fill 11.4 hour shifts. There are two day shift officers, two night shift officers and a sergeant who works 1230 to midnight to overlap the shifts. There is one officer per car. The sergeant is adjusted forward or back three (3) hours when patrol officers are off to close the gap when they are working alone.<sup>41</sup>

Unless the BSC is attempting to advance an argument that every patrol car should contain a patrol officer and a supervisor, then it only stands to reason that the patrol officer will be “alone” at times, but this does not mean that the patrol officer does not have proper supervision. What does the BSC mean when it indicates “proper supervision”? With the patrol sergeant on-duty, the sergeant is available to back the patrol officer up when needed and answer any questions that might arise. The sergeant will review any reports prepared.

It must be made clear, at this point, that patrol sergeants in such a small agency are, by necessity, working supervisors. They should respond to and handle radio calls in the same manner as a patrol officer. With the very low level of activity at Mt. Arlington, this is not particularly difficult and patrol duties should be clearly listed in the sergeant’s job description. Actually, the agency size dictates the lieutenant should also be a working supervisor. How does scheduling a supervisor to an overlapping schedule interfere with that supervisor’s ability to supervise? The only conclusion is that the BSC feels that to adequately supervise, the sergeant must be in the direct presence of the patrol officer.

The current rank structure at MAPD appears to be rather tall, i.e., very few subordinates under one supervisor. The traditional span of control in law enforcement agencies, once averaged nationally, is 1:7, or one supervisor for every 7 police officers.<sup>42</sup> If we are to include all the sergeants and command officers, the Mt. Arlington Police Department certainly rates below this ration. In other words, there should be sufficient supervision with the available number of supervisors, if the lieutenant and the detective sergeant become available for consultation during their shifts.

The BSC goes on to state that this “situation allows the officer to basically do what they (sic) want, unchecked, unchallenged and unguided.”<sup>43</sup> These concerns appear misguided. Though the BSC initially indicated that it would “not in any manor (sic) appraise the abilities or performance of individual members of the police

---

<sup>41</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>42</sup> Lane, T. (2006, October). Span of Control for Law Enforcement Agencies. *The Police Chief*, 73. Retrieved October 17, 2007, from [http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display\\_arch&article\\_id=1022&issue\\_id=102006](http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1022&issue_id=102006)

<sup>43</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 9.

department,”<sup>44</sup> in the next page, the BSC indicated that the officers were observed to perform as trained professionals in a manner that any police executive would be proud of (sic).<sup>45</sup> So where is the indication that leaving a Mt. Arlington police officer unattended would pose a problem? Is the move to shared services necessary to prevent officers from “unchecked, unchallenged and unguided” behaviors? It would appear that the comments of the citizen stakeholders harbor no such concerns, nor did the FOP who initially raised the safety concerns. Moreover, where is the authority for such assertions? It appears to be the sole opinion of BSC, unsupported by studies and uninformed by facts and data. Modern technological advantages (cellular phones, pagers, radios) assure the officer on duty that supervisory guidance and advice is only seconds away. Mt. Arlington is not alone in the challenge of supervisory coverage versus insufficient manpower; this is common across the country and agencies have learned to cope via better written policies and improved technology.

Perhaps pairing an officer with a supervisor in every car was what was intended when the BSC suggested an increase from 13 officers to 21 officers. “Correcting the issue of direct supervision for its uniform patrols (sic) officers would require the Borough of Mt. Arlington to increase staffing to twenty-one officers.”<sup>46</sup> Where is the evidence that such a drastic change, almost doubling the force, would result in an increased benefit to officer and resident safety? It appears that the BSC is attempting to impose staffing burdens to rectify some imagined and possible ethical violations, the nature of which are not known to exist and the proposed solution to which has no demonstrated effectiveness.

Continuing along these lines, the BSC reasons, again without empirical data and evidentiary support, that the standards it recommends for police supervision are “the only” reliable method a municipality can use to defend the actions of their police officers if challenged in a civil action.” This overbroad conclusion lacks any evidence for its assertions. Again, the Mayor and Borough Council and all others relying upon this study are supposed to adopt the BSC’s conclusions without challenge and without demanding any empirical support which would justify such drastic measures. Was the threat of civil lawsuits against its officers the justification for the BSC study? The Borough resolution does not support such a conclusion. What data has the BSC collected with regard to the current or past lawsuits against the department. One insider who wishes to remain anonymous has indicated that there has not been a lawsuit against the department for police misconduct since at least 1994. With access to all department records, this information could easily have been obtained by BSC.

The residents, from their comments at the Borough Council meeting, are concerned about actual safety. The FOP, in its letter to the Mayor and in the flyer it

---

<sup>44</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 2.

<sup>45</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 3.

<sup>46</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 10.

circulated to residents, is concerned about actual safety. The report, instead, raises a red herring of possible unethical conduct that may or may not have some indirect relationship to safety issues, the causal relationship of which remains undefined. To address these specious concerns, the recommendation of almost doubling the force seemingly contradicts the application of the state and national staffing averages and imposes a staffing obligation on Mt. Arlington, the likes of which are not enjoyed by any of the neighboring communities. Indeed, between the four jurisdictions compared, Mt. Arlington is the only force whose staff most closely approximates the averages and they enjoy the lowest crime rate of the four jurisdictions, comparatively. Yet the BSC indicates that the officers need more supervision to prevent them from doing that which they shouldn't be doing. It appears that the BSC is attempting to fix a problem that does not appear to exist, while ignoring the elephant in the room.

“A new and higher standard has emerged for evaluating the effectiveness of crime policies. Evidence-based policymaking . . . has become one of the most important developments in criminology.”<sup>47</sup> Evidence-based policymaking rejects “hope, wishful thinking, good intentions and even policies whose assumptions are extrapolated from other evidence” (e.g. since we know that the Mine Hill and Wharton Borough blending worked, we can assume it will also work with Mt. Arlington). It demands empirical evidence demonstrating a policy's effectiveness.<sup>48</sup>

The staffing recommendation of the BSC seems to be nothing more than wishful thinking of BSC. With incomplete data, no references to sources, or studies, and no meaningful discussion of the basis of the safety concerns, any recommendations are hollow. These recommendations, however, appear more malignant. By encouraging the Borough to agree that staffing must double to prevent ethical violations from occurring, it then forces the conclusion that existing budgetary resources are insufficient to fund such operations, making the decision to enter into a shared services agreement a seemingly necessary, though inherently flawed, choice.

The illogicality of such a proposed solution is further exacerbated by the lack of mention in the discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the shared services agreement of the specific level of supervision that would be offered to the Mt. Arlington patrol officers who need direct supervision to prevent their “unchecked, unchallenged and unguided” actions. If such supervision was necessary if Mt. Arlington retains its independent police force, why is it no longer necessary or important when services are shared? How is such supervision likely to increase when the staffing at the neighboring communities is already sub-standard and with the combined populations of Mt. Arlington, would be even more so?

The evidence-based policy movement demands that policy analysts should review all of the available studies, and not simply base a recommendation on a single

---

<sup>47</sup> Walker, S. (2006). Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson, p. 7.

<sup>48</sup> Id. at p. 10.

study that might support its effectiveness.<sup>49</sup> Time and time again, the BSC advances conclusions, not a single one of which is supported by any study, let alone a single study which may not represent the consensus of the social science community. There is not a single reference to an outside source beyond the 2000 census and the BSC's own solicitation letter, throughout the 28-page opinion essay. If submitted in a college-level policy analysis class, this "study" would have failed to have met the basic requirements for a passing grade given the glaring absence of reasoned and supported analysis of existing policy.

### *B. Officer Response Time*

Generally, there is no direct correlation between simply adding police officers to an existing force and a reduction in crime. As the Kansas City and Newark experiments demonstrated, the increase in patrol officers, without more, will not increase the deterrent effect of patrol. Crimes committed indoors are not even preventable or detectable by patrol.

Another commonly held misconception by lay persons is that crime could be reduced if police arrived at crime scenes faster. It is logical, at first blush, to think that if the police arrived at the scene faster there would be a better chance of arresting the offender. Who hasn't observed someone running a red light and wished there was an officer there to nab the offender? However, on closer inspection, the reasoning appears flawed.

At the outset, the police react to very few crimes in progress. Depending on the study, between 17 and 30 percent of all dispatches actually involve criminal activity.<sup>50</sup> Of that low figure, the vast majority, 75%, involve "cold" crimes – for example an auto theft that occurred hours before. In such cases, the offender is long gone and officer response time will not matter.<sup>51</sup> The remaining quarter of crime-related dispatch calls constitute "involvement" crimes where a victim and suspect are involved in a confrontation. Often the victim and suspect are acquaintances and, thus, the victim can identify the suspect to the police regardless of the police response time.

Lastly, victims do not always call the police immediately. When traumatized and under the stress of the criminal occurrence, they may call a friend or family member first. This factor, as well, renders police travel time inconsequential. "Faster response time might make a difference in [approximately] 3 percent" of cases, such as in the case of a robbery in progress.<sup>52</sup> Examining the crime rate data, there does not appear to be much support for the conclusion that decreased response time would have reduced the already low numbers, further. Crime, its roots, its effect on a community, and

---

<sup>49</sup> Id. at pp. 10 – 11.

<sup>50</sup> Walker, S. (2006). *Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide (6th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth / Thomson, p. 92.

<sup>51</sup> Id. at p. 93, citing Spelman, W. & Brown, D.K. (1984) *Calling the police: Citizen reporting of serious crime*. DC: Department of Justice.

<sup>52</sup> Id.

prevention strategies are all complex issues, they simply cannot be addressed by reducing the problem to its lowest common denominator, manpower. A community that wishes to engage itself in a comprehensive crime-reduction effort must apply a multi-disciplinary approach and avoid the trap of easy answers; there aren't any.

Mt. Arlington experienced no robberies, the crime in which faster response time might have made a difference. The four violent crimes it did experience were all aggravated assaults, and the victim could have known and identified his or her assailant. Of the property crimes, the 12 burglaries are indoor crimes not likely to be detectable on patrol and not likely to be reported while still in progress. There were 37 larcenies or thefts. If these thefts had been committed in the presence of another, it would have constituted a robbery, instead. Thus, these crimes suggest that no one either was present when the crime was committed or, if so, was unaware at the time. Therefore, at least on its face, it appears unlikely that faster response time would have mattered for the thefts. The remaining 3 property crimes were motor vehicle thefts. While routine patrol might have detected these offenses in progress, or an alert neighbor could have observed the crime and called the police, generally the victim does not become aware of the offense and report it to the police until some time later, also negating the likelihood that faster response time would have mattered.

While the above analysis is largely speculative, due to the rushed nature of the instant report, with only 56 crimes reported in 2006, and six months to a year to complete its review of data and report its findings,<sup>53</sup> BSC could have easily computed which of these reported crimes were detected as the result of patrol and which were ameliorated due to a fast response time. Yet, again, the study neglected to obtain and report on this accessible data. The BSC also neglected to obtain the response time data which would be maintained by the Morris County Sheriffs Department dispatch services.

The BSC claims that traditional response time for a community of Mt. Arlington's size should be between 2 and 3 minutes, yet again fails to provide any support for this assertion. The report then concludes that the Mt. Arlington Police Department does provide a response within this time frame. This assertion prompts more questions. Is this projected response time based on every response or is this an average computation, which might suggest some responses are sufficiently quicker and others might be longer? If Mt. Arlington is responding, in all instances, within 2 – 3 minutes, this would tend to indicate that there is no actual safety problem that has resulted from the sporadic shift shortages.

Then, incredulously, the BSC continues by claiming that the "responses (sic) are easily verified daily by both the response of the police department and the great service

---

<sup>53</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007). Resolution 2007-79. A resolution of the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Mount Arlington in the County of Morris, New Jersey, Awarding a Professional Services Contract to Blueshield Consulting Services.

that the department provides.”<sup>54</sup> Most skilled researchers would understand that response time was verifiable by the dispatch data, which was unreferenced here. Indicating that the “responses” are verified by the police “response” is simply redundant and circular logic. Adding that police response is somehow verifiable by its “great service,” appears to be nothing more than unsolicited flattery. More importantly, beyond the mere assertion, there is no indication as to why the service is considered “great,” and how this translates to a known and verifiable 2 – 3 minute response time.

Finally, that the BSC considers the services the department provides to be “great,” would tend to run counter to its claim that more supervisors are needed to guard against “unchecked, unchallenged and unguided” actions of its officers.<sup>55</sup> It is recommended that if a further study is commissioned, that the actual dispatch data be obtained and that the actual crime data be analyzed to determine the relative importance of the patrol function and the police response time as it relates to the safety of Mt. Arlington residents.

The above analysis demonstrates that adding additional patrols and increasing response time would likely have no impact, or little impact, on resident safety. Thus, almost doubling the staff to pair supervisor with officer would likely not result in an added benefit to crime reduction or amelioration and almost certainly would not result in any reduced response time. On the flip side, it could also be said that an increase in the length of police response time that might follow, should the Borough elect to pursue a shared services agreement, and a decrease in patrol function, might not have any negative impact on crime rates or public safety. However, there has also been no evidence provided, argument or supported rationale to suggest that shared services would offer an improvement to the current situation. At best, there would be no change. At worst, it could become less safe, depending on the type of crime reported and the manner in which the officers are assigned.

### *C. Detective Clearance Rates*

A related void with respect to obtainable but uncollected data rests with the Detective Clearance Rate. The BSC boasts that Roxbury claims a 65% clearance rate.<sup>56</sup> In comparison to national clearance rates, this number is, indeed, impressive. The national average for all cities and agencies of violent offenses known to the police and cleared through arrest is 45.5% and the clearance rate for property offenses, nationally, is only 16.3%.<sup>57</sup> The BSC report did not indicate whether the Detective Clearance Rate in Roxbury was for the violent crime, its property crime, or both.

---

<sup>54</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 6.

<sup>55</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 10.

<sup>56</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 17.

<sup>57</sup> Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007). Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics online. Table 4.19.2005. Offenses known to police and percent cleared by arrest by offense and population group, 2005. Retrieved October 17, 2007 from: <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t4192005.pdf>

Examining the statistics on clearance rates further, the clearance rate appears to increase the smaller the population of the city. Thus, in cities with a million or more residents, there was a 34.9% clearance rate for violent crimes reported, in cities with between 100,000 and 249,000 there was a 41.8% clearance rate, cities, including Roxbury Township, with populations between 10,000 and 24,999 offered a 54% clearance rate and cities with a population akin to Mt. Arlington, under 10,000, claimed a 58.6% clearance rate.<sup>58</sup> The clearance rates for property crimes in these same population groups followed a similar pattern, with a slight decline for the smallest of populations, with clearance rates at 12.2%, 15%, 21% and 19.7%, respectively.<sup>59</sup>

Thus, the Roxbury clearance rate, regardless of whether it represents the clearance rate for violent offenses or property offenses, would appear to be higher than that of the clearance rate for other similarly sized populations. However, given the statistical trend, Mt. Arlington's detective clearance rate, should be even higher, given its smaller population.

Such a projection corresponds with the conclusions, 40 years ago, of the President's Crime Commission. The Crime Commission analyzed a sample of 1,905 cases. As to those in which a suspect was immediately identified by a victim or witness, 86% were cleared. However, as to those cases in which the suspect was unknown to the victim or witnesses, only 12% were cleared. Thus, the ability to successfully clear offenses by arrest would be largely dependent upon the relationship between the victim and the suspect and the ability of the victim or witnesses to provide a good lead.<sup>60</sup> This would also explain why the vast majority of all arrests are made by patrol officers instead of detectives.<sup>61</sup>

It stands to reason, the smaller the population, the more likely it would be the residents know each other. In a population of approximately 5,000 residents, strangers would garner special attention due to this fact and would enjoy less anonymity than in a larger urban setting. Similarly, if one resident engaged in a crime against another, it would be more likely that the suspect and victim would know each other, which would not necessarily be true in a large urban setting or even a population the size of Roxbury.

As the BSC was given up to a year to gather this data and access to all necessary records and personnel at the department to compute or obtain this data,<sup>62</sup> it is unclear why such data was not received in order to prepare a more informed

---

<sup>58</sup> Id.

<sup>59</sup> Id.

<sup>60</sup> Walker, S. (2006). *Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide (6th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth / Thomson, p. 96, citing Skogan, W., Antunes, G. (1979) "Information, Apprehension and Deterrence: Exploring the limits of police productivity." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 7:217-241.

<sup>61</sup> Id., citing Reiss, A.J. (1971) *The police and the public*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, p. 104.

<sup>62</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007). Resolution 2007-79. A resolution of the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Mount Arlington in the County of Morris, New Jersey, Awarding a Professional Services Contract to Blueshield Consulting Services.

comparison. If Mt. Arlington currently enjoys a higher detective clearance rate than Roxbury, then Roxbury's impressive rate would be of no consequence. It is recommended that if a further study is commissioned, that the actual clearance rate data be obtained for Mt. Arlington Borough, as well as that of Jefferson Township and Wharton / Mine Hill.

The inclusion of the clearance rate for Roxbury is also misguided, in that there is no indication that Roxbury would assign additional detectives, from its new hires, and if it did, that would result in a trade-off in the number of patrol officers. Without such additional detectives, the efficiency of its existing staff could be compromised as a result, especially given that the number of unsolved cases would necessarily increase should the services be shared and populations combined. With combined populations, Roxbury would move into a higher grouping and, if the statistical trend follows, its clearance rate would necessarily decrease.

#### *D. Community-Oriented Policing*

While adding more officers, without changing patrol structure or officer assignments, does not offer any realistic benefits to resident safety, there are some strategies that might. Problem-oriented policing ("POP") uses planning and problem-solving techniques to solve crime problems in a limited geographical area. In one study, an analysis of police calls revealed that 5% of addresses generated 64% of all calls.<sup>63</sup> If Mt. Arlington could identify similar "hot spots" in its community, it could concentrate proactive policing strategies in this more limited area. The National Academy of Sciences has concluded that although the research is still preliminary, "a strong body of evidence [exists to suggest] that taking a focused geographic approach to crime problems can increase the effectiveness of policing."<sup>64</sup>

In Jersey City, a study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the POP approach. This jurisdiction identified 12 pairs of "hot spots," with identifiable crime problems. One area in each pair received focused attention by police and community agencies, while the other served as a control area. Of the 28 strategies employed in the experimental areas were those related to traditional policing, including aggressive order maintenance and rug enforcement. However, the majority of the most commonly used strategies involved a more nontraditional approach. For example, store owners were required to improve the appearance of their store fronts, the Public Works Department cleaned trash from the street and additional lighting was installed where needed. Thus, the business community and other government agencies were integral to the design of this study. The evaluation revealed that the program was largely successful, with measurable crime reduction in 10 out of 12 of the targeted hot spots.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Id. at p. 93, citing Sherman, L.W., Gartin, P.R. and Buerger, M.E. (1989) "Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place." *Criminology* 27: 27-55.

<sup>64</sup> Id., citing National Academy of Sciences (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. DC: National Academy Press.

<sup>65</sup> Id., at p. 299, citing Braga, A.A., Weisburd, E.J., Mazzerolle, L.G., Spelman, W. and Gajewski, F. (1999). "Problem-Oriented Policing in Violent Crime Places: A Randomized Controlled Experiment." *Criminology* 37: 541-580.

The federal government also appreciated the promise that this new approach to crime prevention offered and instituted the Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program. This new government entity offered obscene amounts of grant money to local police departments for the hiring of new officers, for technology to free officers from administrative duties and make them available to interact with the community on the streets, and for the development of innovative community-policing strategies.

A national evaluation of the COPS program revealed that for jurisdictions of 10,000 or more residents that received at least one dollar in grant funding per resident for hiring purposes enjoyed a correlating decline in 5.26 crimes per 100,000 people. However, this same benefit was not enjoyed by communities with fewer than 10,000 residents, where COPS funding was found to correlate to an increase in crime.

The disparity in results between small and large jurisdictions could simply be the result of part-time communities, such as Califon, mentioned by *Bill Cacko at 130A Schmitz Terrace* in his comments to Borough Council on August 13, 2007. Mr. Cacko pointed out that since Califon had only two officers on its staff and no coverage at all during weekends or holidays, any additional coverage to fill these gaps was appreciated.<sup>66</sup> It stands to reason that if a police force is only covering a portion of the hours of a given week, that adding additional officers to cover the remaining hours would likely generate additional arrests and would result in an apparent increase in the crime rate. That is not the situation, here, with Mt. Arlington, as the force is full-time and not part-time and as there is at least one officer, and usually two, on duty at all times.

Community policing arose in the early 1980's after the Kansas City Patrol Experiment dispelled the notion that the greater the police presence, the fewer the crimes, and after other policy myths that reducing police response time or increasing detective clearance rates could materially impact the crime rate.<sup>67</sup> The key principle guiding this innovation in policing was that police couldn't solve the crime problem alone; the cooperation of citizens and neighborhood groups was essential.

Disbanding a community police agency and outsourcing the services to a neighboring community is one-step removed from the police-community partnership required under the problem-oriented approach. While some of the officers might continue and some of them may end up patrolling the same streets, there are no guarantees in this regard. With the high school, police department and court in another town entirely, the community of Mt. Arlington would eventually be left without the influence of school officials, law enforcement personnel and judicial representatives with a vested interest in preserving and maintaining the shared values of the community. The importance of collective efficacy, which requires "trust among residents in a

---

<sup>66</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007, August 13). Council Meeting Minutes. Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: <http://www.ci.mount-arlington.nj.us/council/081307minutes.pdf>

<sup>67</sup> Walker, S. (2007). Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson, p. 298.

neighborhood and their shared expectations about their . . . capacity to exercise control over their neighborhood,” cannot be overstated.<sup>68</sup> Empirical evidence supports this conclusion.

An expansive study based out of Chicago observed conditions in over 23,000 street segments, applied measures of social and physical disorder to over 196 neighborhoods and tracked seven cohorts of children and their families, ultimately involving approximately 6,500 children and surveying 3,500 residents. Collective efficacy was measured in terms of how well residents worked together to solve neighborhood problems and whether they felt they could call and rely upon the police to exercise control over shared areas and safe zones. Controls were established to account for economic conditions.

The data clearly indicated that, “[w]ithin limits, residents have [an] impact on the level of crime.” While “[c]ollective efficacy emphasizes what citizens believe and do[,] [t]raditional crime policies [tend to] focus entirely on what criminal justice agencies do.”<sup>69</sup> This conclusion was reached in other related studies as well. With collective efficacy, victims of domestic violence were more likely to seek support in the community when experiencing conflicts in their relationships resulting in a lower incidence of such offenses.<sup>70</sup> And a study in Detroit connected lower rates of burglary with collective efficacy, holding that “[n]eighborhoods with active community organizations and a politically active citizenry were better able to control crime than others.”<sup>71</sup>

In stark contrast to these empirical findings is the conclusion in the BSC study that “The Wharton Borough Police Department and its officers have proven their ability to deliver service appropriately for the last five years to Mine Hill Township.”<sup>72</sup> This opinion is hollow, lacking supporting facts, data or outside authority and self-serving given BSC’s vested interest in the long-term success of the Wharton / Mine Hill pairing. That the Wharton Borough Chief has been successful in his expanded tasks does not address the result to the collective efficacy of the Mine Hill community.

Earlier comments that the Wharton / Mine Hill agreement brokered by BSC “has served both communities well with significant cost savings to both” and “provided leadership, supervision, lower cost of police operations, controlled municipal taxes and . . . additional space for one municipality and a revenue source for the other” are also similarly hollow without supporting documentation and without the data to permit

---

<sup>68</sup> Id. at p. 295 citing Sampson, R.J. & Raudenbush, S.W. (1999, November.). “Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods,” *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 603-651.

<sup>69</sup> Id. at p. 296, citing Sampson & Raudenbush, “Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces.”

<sup>70</sup> Id. at p. 296, citing Browning, C.R. (2002). “The Span of Collective Efficacy: Extending Social Disorganization Theory to Partner Violence.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64: 833-850.

<sup>71</sup> Id. citing Martin, D. (2002). “Spatial Patterns in Residential Burglary: Assessing the Effect of Neighborhood Social Capital.” *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 18: 132 – 146.

<sup>72</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 20.

meaningful examination of the extent of these alleged cost savings.<sup>73</sup> Most notable, however, is the lack of mention of any improvement to the safety of the community, the safety of the officers or the collective efficacy of the community.

## 2. Officer Safety

The FOP expressed safety concerns related to single officer shifts, the lack of overtime to address shift shortages, and the danger should adequate reinforcement not be available.<sup>74</sup> These safety concerns were not expressly stated or recognized in the BSC study, except to propose an additional eight officers, presumably at the supervisor's level, be added to the existing Mt. Arlington force. Yet in urging the expansion of a force by approximately 61% despite its satisfaction of an advanced state and national average and despite the understaffing by those same standards of the surrounding communities under consideration, the basis advanced was not officer safety, but instead protection of the municipality from civil liability should the unsupervised officers engage in "unchecked, unchallenged and unguided" activities.<sup>75</sup>

In response to the BSC's rhetorical suggestion that such a drastic recommendation was "overkill,"<sup>76</sup> the BSC then referenced its own letter soliciting the instant professional services contract. In that earlier letter, which sought to obtain a sizeable financial payment for the instant professional services, BSC appealed to the Mayor and Borough Council's fear of the monetary consequences of unchecked civil liability.<sup>77</sup> This emotional appeal was vague, bearing no reference to any actual past, pending or threatened litigation. The appeal was unsupported, with no finding that there had been any police misconduct which would give rise to such a law suit.

After being awarded with the contract, now BSC, in its report, attempts to justify its present unsupported recommendations with its earlier unsupported "forecast."<sup>78</sup> This would be humorous if there wasn't so much at stake.

There is no indication how these additional eight officers (or supervisors) would be scheduled to ensure officer safety. Indeed, there is no direct mention of the concerns related to officer safety; the only basis for such a recommendation seems to lie in avoiding some imaginary threat of civil liability. With six months to a year to gather data, why didn't the BSC collect information on lawsuits related to police misconduct at Mt. Arlington and the neighboring communities? Why wasn't there any effort to establish whether the actions of the officers it had the opportunity to observe were performing substandard? The brief observation conducted resulted in the conclusion

---

<sup>73</sup> Id. at p. 10

<sup>74</sup> 2007, March 21). Roxbury Register.

<sup>75</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 9.

<sup>76</sup> Id. at p. 11.

<sup>77</sup> Id.

<sup>78</sup> Id.

that the officer's performance would make any police executive proud<sup>79</sup> and the BSC summarily announced it would not, "in any manor (sic) appraise the abilities or performance of individual members of the police department." In sum, the BSC abdicated its responsibility to meaningfully review the FOP's concerns in order to reinforce its own earlier vacant prediction.

#### *A. Single Officer on Patrol:*

As explained above under *1.A. Staffing Rates, supra*, the concerns with respect to single officer patrol relate only to instances when officers elect to use personal, sick or vacation time. There are approximately 31 hours per week that could be scheduled with a single officer. These are limited to weeknights from 3 a.m. to 6 a.m. and weekends from 6 a.m. to noon.<sup>80</sup>

There are other remedies, far less drastic than disbanding the force, entering into a shared services agreement or increasing the force by 61% in order to satisfy the FOP's concerns. Police organizations across the country routinely enact mutual aid agreements (sometimes referred to as memorandums of understanding) to ensure they formalized the assistance police officers provide each other as a matter of practice. No police officer would ever refuse to respond, or back up, another police officer in distress, regardless of department jurisdictional lines or geopolitical boundaries.

This unique trait of law enforcement officers has historical roots and is founded on the basic survival instinct police officers are imbued with from their first day at the police academy- it is a brotherhood or sisterhood and officers depend on each other regardless of the color of the uniform they wear. The establishing of MOA/MOU's provides the legal support administrators require to cover liabilities issues. There are no sound reasons for the Mt. Arlington Police Department not to enter into such legal agreements with surrounding police forces. In addition, additional back-up support for the scheduled patrol officer(s) can be provided with alternative shift hours by the chief and the lieutenant. The added visibility of command staff is always a morale booster for line officers.

#### *B. Overtime*

The FOP expressed concerns that overtime was not offered to rectify the staffing shortages, yet sources indicate that 105 hours was paid in 2006.<sup>81</sup> Certainly, the fees that were used to fund the BSC study could have been extended toward considerable overtime pay. That notwithstanding, the FOP ignores the safety risk posed by overtime, especially in smaller departments such as Mt. Arlington. After having already completed one 11.5 hour shift, an officer on overtime could find himself or herself working a straight 23 hours. The attendant danger resulting from lack of sleep could

---

<sup>79</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 3.

<sup>80</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>81</sup> Id.

have serious consequences, given the continual driving obligations of the job, the possession of a weapon and the critical decisions that an officer may be confronted with while on the job. Mistakes made while physically exhausted due to sleep deprivation could also result in serious civil liability. Under carefully proscribed conditions and limitations, however, it could offer a short-term solution to the problem at hand, until such time as an additional officer can be hired.

### *C. Officer Pay*

It has been raised by the FOP and confirmed in the BSC study that the Mt. Arlington police officers are amongst the lowest paid in the county.<sup>82</sup> With below-average salaries, the officer often feels obligated to secure additional employment to supplement his or her income. There are safety and ethical complications from such an arrangement, however.

As was discussed above under overtime, working increased hours could lead to sleep deprivation and create a safety problem on the job. Moonlighting is even more problematic than in-house overtime as there are fewer controls on the number of hours an officer works while off-duty. There is also the possible conflict of interest that might present itself due to the job duties of the second employment.

### *D. Reinforcement*

Currently, a single officer or multiple patrol in Mt. Arlington can call upon the surrounding communities on an as-needed basis for "Mutual Aid" should the need for reinforcement present itself (see above). The FOP raises the possibility that such Mutual Aid may not be available, given the constraints of the other jurisdictions. The BSC study points out that Mutual Aid "should be reserved for extreme emergencies" and an officer working alone could not be "guaranteed any backup in a timely manor (sic)." Will all bluntness, however, there are few guarantees in life, and most, if not all officers, in any jurisdiction, aren't even guaranteed that they will return home safely at the end of their shift. Officers appreciate this, understand this, and still show up for work every day despite this uncertainty. There is a fraternity among police officers, regardless of agency that would, at a minimum, act to guarantee that as long as another officer was capable of responding, he or she would. This is as close to a "guarantee" as is possible.

The practice of mutual aid was developed for a practical purpose: to provide for small, neighboring municipalities to support each other when necessary. Given the low crime rate (see Table 2) it would not appear likely that such requests would be necessary often. Despite having six months to a year to gather data and despite having access to all department records, there was no attempt to survey the past use of the Mutual Aid compact by Mt. Arlington and the cooperating jurisdictions. This data, if

---

<sup>82</sup> Mt. Arlington Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #78. (2007, July 27). Notice to Mount Arlington Residents; Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 3.

collected and reviewed, could be used to show whether such requests for aid were more often granted, and how often Mt. Arlington officers were called and responded to other communities. Perhaps the data would show that, to date, there had never been a request for reinforcement that was not fulfilled, satisfactorily, by at least one of the communities. In such an instance, to speculate that a failure to render aid might happen one day in the near or distant future is, again, a fallacious appeal to emotion. It is no different than pointing out how a single fire department lost over 300 agents in the tragic events of September 11<sup>th</sup><sup>83</sup> as if to suggest that such a statistical anomaly should somehow factor into the staffing considerations of a small police department. In sum, more data is required before a meaningful evaluation of the benefits and risks of the Mutual Aid compact can be undertaken.

### 3. Cost – Benefit Analysis

There is considerable information that should have been collected and reviewed, in order to make the cost and benefit analysis of a police shared services agreement, meaningful. Despite having been authorized access to the “Borough’s Municipal and Police Department Ordinances, regulations, records, correspondence, and documents,” to include the “records . . . of the Municipal Court” and access to police and court personnel,<sup>84</sup> regrettably, most of this information has not been obtained or, if it has, is not reflected in the BSC report.

For example, the BSC refers to the borough resolution that authorizes payment of out-of-pocket costs for all retired officers, over the age of 65, and their spouses, claims that BSC had no means to measure this cost but is confident that it would be “very large.” However, this is capable of measurement. There are six retired officers.<sup>85</sup> This benefit may not apply to all of these officers, since they may not have reached the age of 65 as of yet. As an expense of the department, this cost should be reflected in either the financial statement for the city or department or the budget for the department. The financial analyst, when computing the Actuary Report, can project the anticipated costs of this benefit. Given that there are only six retirees, at present, there seems to be no basis to conclude that this cost was “very large” as was speculated.

Moreover, the BSC represents that disbanding the police department would “end the benefit and associated costs for ever (sic).”<sup>86</sup> While this might be true as to future retirees, the benefit has most likely vested in those who have already retired and cannot be taken away. An employment law attorney should be consulted to fully evaluate the legal obligations imposed under the terms of the resolution.

---

<sup>83</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 9.

<sup>84</sup> Borough of Mount Arlington. (2007). Resolution 2007-79. A resolution of the Mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Mount Arlington in the County of Morris, New Jersey, Awarding a Professional Services Contract to Blueshield Consulting Services.

<sup>85</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>86</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, pp. 22 - 23.

There are entire gaps of data – such as the absence of any dollar figures relative to the Municipal Courts and ambiguity concerning the agreed upon court services. With respect to the Municipal Courts, the BSC explains the two options available: a Shared Court or a Joint Court. After discussing first the Joint Court arrangement and then the Shared Court arrangement, BSC “anticipates that the Courts of Roxbury Township, Jefferson Township and the Joint Court of Wharton / Mine Hill would have no difficulty providing this service.”<sup>87</sup> What does the BSC mean with respect to “this:” a shared or joint court system? In context, it might appear to refer to the shared court system, since that was the system discussed immediately prior to the anticipated. Yet, how would it work if the Wharton and Mine Hill courts are joint, but the Mt. Arlington court is shared?

The BSC further speculates that there “may be some savings from a Shared Court in the reduction of personnel.” It would be helpful to know the budgetary allocations for court personnel in order to place these savings in their proper perspective. It would also be helpful to compare the volume of the Mt. Arlington Municipal Courts with that of the other communities, in terms of the number of cases processed, in order to more definitively establish whether a reduction in court personnel would be realistic.

Any savings from this speculative reduction in personnel whose salaries are not known would be offset by the recent appointment of the Judge to a three year term, which will not expire until December of 2009.<sup>88</sup> Again, to appreciate how much this might offset the other benefit, it is essential to be informed of the judge’s salary and review the actual terms and conditions of the appointment.

It would also be helpful to know what other costs of operation applied – in terms of the facility, its operational costs and the revenue it generates. What are the current operational costs of the Mt. Arlington court? If services transfer, what percentage of these costs will result in a net savings? What are the costs at the other three courts and what would be Mt. Arlington’s contribution to those costs? For the Joint Court option another consideration is how long it will take to secure approval of the Office of Administration of the Courts and any costs that may be related to that process.

Under a shared court, the revenue generated within Mt. Arlington would be returned to Mt. Arlington. Would the “lead” jurisdiction under the shared services agreement, however, expect a portion of these fees? What would be the arrangement under a joint court? Would revenue be split in any manner or would all of the revenue go to the lead jurisdiction?

---

<sup>87</sup> Id. at p. 12, emphasis added.

<sup>88</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 11.

Another entire gap of data is that lack of inclusion of any officer salary information for Jefferson Township. Without such information, the BSC conclusion that “cost per officer operation [at Jefferson] would be higher than Mt. Arlington rate”<sup>89</sup> is vacuous. How much higher is it? One hundred dollars? One thousand dollars? One hundred thousand dollars? Since the cost per officer operation is also higher at both Roxbury and Wharton / Mine Hill, this conclusion does not aid the policy maker in determining which jurisdiction, of the three presented, is most cost effective.

The salary information provided as to Mt. Arlington Police Department is also misleading. The figure for the officer salary was computed by averaging all salaries. The chief’s salary, however, at \$110,000 per year,<sup>90</sup> tends to unfairly inflate this average. In reality, starting salary for new officers at Mt. Arlington is approximately \$45,000,<sup>91</sup> a figure that does not appear at all in the BSC report. There is also no mention of the contractual obligations owed to the Chief of Police and whether the borough would be required to honor the remainder of the contract regardless of disbandment. Thus, hiring eight new officers would not approximate the \$880,000<sup>92</sup> estimated in the BSC study.

There is also no inclusion of civilian employees in the comparisons. With an increase between six and ten officers, and the attendant increase in service calls and paperwork, there will be an added administrative burden. Will additional administrative assistance be a factor in these agreements?

To claim that any policy analyst or policy maker can make an informed decision based on the incomplete data gathered is disingenuous. A hasty decision which fails to adequately consider the true financial and logistical ramifications could cost the city considerably.

A partial list of the financial documents from the city of Mount Arlington, its police department and dispatch services, which should have been reviewed, and which any further study should consider, include but are not limited to:

1. Financial Statement for the Borough of Mount Arlington or that of its police department and Municipal Court, if separately maintained;
2. Profit and loss statement for the Mount Arlington Police Department and Municipal Court.
3. Budgets of the Mount Arlington Police Department and Municipal Court for the past five years.
4. Data on hours of overtime paid during time period in #4, above, if not otherwise reflected in financial statement or budget.

---

<sup>89</sup> Id., p. 16.

<sup>90</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>91</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com)

<sup>92</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 11.

5. Data on out-of-pocket expenses reimbursed pursuant to borough resolution to retired Mt. Arlington police department officers and their spouses, if not otherwise reflected in financial statement or budget; resolution authorizing same.
6. Any existing contracts for civilian and sworn employees of the Mt. Arlington Police Department and Municipal Court.
7. Grant funding awards and pending applications for both the Mt. Arlington Police Department and Municipal Court.
8. Experience and training level of individual officers; i.e. how many hours in basic academy, advanced and specialized training and certifications.
9. Actual pay per officer.
10. Review of pending or threatened litigation and/or citizen complaints regarding police services.
11. State-mandated training requirements (POST) such as basic and continuing training.
12. Number of years each officer has been in law enforcement and the number of years each officer has worked at Mt. Arlington Police Department.
13. Operational data necessary to compute the Police Allocation Model to include shift length, relief factors, the average number of hours per year per officer spent on patrol, and other information obtainable from computer-aided dispatch databases.
14. Calls-for-service data runs by week, month and one sample year.
15. Mutual Aid compacts or agreements and related dispatch data.
16. Police reports and related data for UCR crimes reflected in Table 2.
17. Detective clearance rate data.
18. Population growth projections
19. Infrastructure capabilities and limitations.

Once this information is gathered, it will be necessary to employ the services of a financial analyst to prepare an actuarial table, computing the projected profits and losses over a period of time equal to the length of time contemplated for the term of the contract for police shared services. Then, in order to obviate the necessity to obtain a comparable level of data from the neighboring communities being considered, it is suggested that, instead, agencies wishing to enter into such an agreement for shared services submit a bid proposal or draft contract for consideration. In this way, the lead jurisdiction can definitively inform the Borough of its cost requirements in order to inform the policy makers decision.

## **REVIEW OF BSC FINDINGS:**

### *A. Roxbury Township:*

As the “cheapest” of the stated alternatives, based on the limited financial data provided, a partnership with Roxbury Township would result in over a 50% reduction of the existing Mt. Arlington force. Moreover, the Roxbury Township police department would remain well below both the state and national averages, in terms of its staffing.

Given its significantly higher crime rate (see Table 2), and the lack of specificity concerning how and when the additional officers would be utilized and how the community would be serviced, there doesn't appear to be any benefit, with respect to safety of officers or residents, or with regard to cost savings, in partnering with this community at this time and under these terms.

*B. Jefferson Township:*

The BSC rejects consideration of Jefferson Township solely over the provision of medical benefits. The BSC final recommendations indicate that since Jefferson Township indicated it would not consider hiring any officer with over three years of service as this would be too costly to the taxpayers of Jefferson Township.<sup>93</sup> This conclusion does not appear to be accurate as it contradicts the information BSC provides in its earlier summary of Jefferson Township benefits and disadvantages.

The medical benefits available to Jefferson Township officers, which appear to be superior to those presently offered by Mt. Arlington, will not fully vest until an officer has provided 12 years of service to Jefferson Township.<sup>94</sup> Thus, a Mt. Arlington officer, hired by Jefferson Township, would have to work an additional 12 years for Jefferson Township, regardless of his length of service with Mt. Arlington, before these benefits would accrue. It may be that the officer would be willing to put another 12 years into Jefferson Township to acquire medical benefits that he or she never would have earned at Mt. Arlington. Thus, Jefferson Township did not appear to be precluding the possibility of hiring more experienced officers, provided that these officers were willing to complete the 12 additional years of service to Mt. Arlington in order to acquire the medical benefits.

In a compromise effort, Jefferson Township offers, essentially, a "three year" credit for those with less than three years of service, which would then still allow for nine additional years of service to Jefferson, a length of time that would make the provision of such benefits economical for its taxpayers. So, it's only if the proposed shared services agreement requires that Jefferson credit Mt. Arlington officers with its service on the Mt. Arlington force that the three-year restriction would be applied. Otherwise, it would appear that any officer could be hired and work the dozen years required.

Another alternative to explore might be to calculate the financial cost of this benefit and to incorporate that into the contract for shared services to permit the hiring of officers with more experience to serve for a shorter period of time before the benefits vest. Again, without knowing what the salary differential is, it is not possible to analyze the ramifications of this restriction from a financial viewpoint.

As was the case with Roxbury, the Jefferson proposal would reduce the existing Mt. Arlington force by 50% and the newly blended police department would fall

---

<sup>93</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 25.

<sup>94</sup> Id. at p. 15.

significantly below state and national averages in terms of its ratio of sworn officers per 1000 residents. It is difficult to grasp how this would result in any improvement to the safety concerns of residents of Mt. Arlington and the officers that presently serve that community. Thus, while the BSC's rationale for dismissing this option out of hand is flawed, there remains no compelling justification, based upon the information gathered and presented, to trade the existing Mt. Arlington police department for shared services with Jefferson Township.

### *C. Wharton Borough / Mine Hill*

The BSC, having previously participated in the blending of the police services for these two communities, a partnership that appears by all accounts to have been beneficial to all concerned, attempts to analogize the current situation in an attempt to justify similar drastic action. The current situation in Mt. Arlington bears little or no resemblance, however, to the conditions at Mine Hill that predated its agreement with Wharton. As such, comparisons between the two are misguided.

At Mine Hill, the officers had been without the services of a Chief of Police for approximately almost a year and a half. "[T]here was substantial internal strife within the Mine Hill Police Department that led to ineffective and inefficient police services."<sup>95</sup> In the instant case, there are no complaints about the performance of the Mt. Arlington officers and there appears to be no internal strife. There is a police chief in place and a supervisory structure that is currently effective. Indeed, the officers were observed to "perform as trained professionals in a manner that any police executive would be proud of."<sup>96</sup>

As evidence-based crime policy standards demand, policies that work well in one context, cannot simply be applied to other, inapposite, situations.<sup>97</sup> There are no performance problems amongst the Mt. Arlington staff, as was the case with Mine Hill. If Mine Hill had not entered into an agreement with Wharton, the alternative was the option of relying solely on a State Police arrangement;<sup>98</sup> an option that Mt. Arlington has not considered and need not consider. The desperation that existed at Mine Hill simply does not exist in Mt. Arlington. Quite the contrary, the concern of the residents as expressed to the governance of Mt. Arlington, appears to be one of desperation to keep the existing force.

---

<sup>95</sup> Gagliardi, Jr., V.A. & Custode, F.A. (n.d.). The benefits of consolidated municipal services: A case study of the Township of Mine Hill and the Wharton Police Department. Retrieved on October 18, 2007 from: [http://www.pbnlaw.com/data/articles/The\\_Benefits\\_of\\_Consolidated\\_Municipal\\_Services\\_-\\_294.pdf](http://www.pbnlaw.com/data/articles/The_Benefits_of_Consolidated_Municipal_Services_-_294.pdf), p. 1.

<sup>96</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 3.

<sup>97</sup> Walker, S. (2006). Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth / Thomson, p. 10.

<sup>98</sup> Gagliardi, Jr., V.A. & Custode, F.A. (n.d.). The benefits of consolidated municipal services: A case study of the Township of Mine Hill and the Wharton Police Department. Retrieved on October 18, 2007 from: [http://www.pbnlaw.com/data/articles/The\\_Benefits\\_of\\_Consolidated\\_Municipal\\_Services\\_-\\_294.pdf](http://www.pbnlaw.com/data/articles/The_Benefits_of_Consolidated_Municipal_Services_-_294.pdf), p. 2.

Under the proposed terms of a partnership of Mt. Arlington with the already blended communities of Wharton and Mine Hill, the Mt. Arlington police department would pay \$132,210 additional than is presently the case, an amount roughly equal to the starting salary of three new officers. For the increased expenditure, Mt. Arlington would lose three sworn officers and a secretary. The resulting police force would still be well below the state and national average. As with the other two jurisdictions, there is no indication as to how the officers would be assigned. In sum, the increased expenditure for a decreased staff does not appear to be financially sound. There also appears to be no increased benefit for officer or resident safety. Accordingly, a partnership with Wharton should not be pursued, absent further justification.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The Mt. Arlington police department should continue at its present staffing levels as these appear adequate to meet the safety needs of its residents and the proposed shared services agreement(s) do/does not offer any guarantees that this level of effectiveness will continue or improve. The addition of a single-officer to cover shift shortages might benefit officer safety but does not appear to offer any tangible benefit with regard to resident safety. Conversely, transferring police services to a neighboring community would likely result in fewer officers per capita and could result in a materially decreased level of service and a measurable reduction of safety to the community. This transfer of services, and loss of local governance, will also likely adversely affect the community's efficacy: its perception of safety, security, independence, control and shared values.
2. Alternatives within the Mt. Arlington Police Department or the Mt. Arlington community should be explored to address issues of officer safety. Transferring police services to a neighboring community does not appear to address issues of officer safety. Such alternatives could include, but are not limited, to:
  - a. Restructuring of the patrol function to allow for double-manned vehicles during peak hours and single-manned vehicles or no patrol during off-peak hours.
  - b. Relying upon citizen volunteers to supplement the patrol function.
  - c. Developing a ride-along program.
  - d. Hiring a single officer to cover shift shortages.
  - e. Reviewing the current command and supervisory structure, and job descriptions.
  - f. Obtaining grant funding to secure additional officers or develop community alternatives to traditional patrol.
3. The cost-effectiveness of a possible shared services agreement cannot adequately be determined based on the relatively few figures presented by BSC and its unsupported speculation. Should the Mayor and Borough Council still wish to explore the cost-effectiveness of a proposed shared services agreement,

additional data on costs and services should be collected and analyzed. Once the true financial costs to Mt. Arlington are evaluated, jurisdictions willing to participate should be asked to submit bid proposals or draft contracts to permit meaningful review.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 18 October 2007

---

Coleen M. Cusack, J.D.

Dated: 18 October 2007

---

Luis Martinez, M.Ed.

**TABLE 1. BOROUGH and TOWNSHIP COMPARISON**

	Mt. Arlington	Roxbury	Jefferson	Wharton / Mine Hill (combined)
<b>POPULATION DATA</b>				
Population 2000 census <sup>99</sup>	4,663	23,883	19,717	9,977
Population 2006 FBI / UCR <sup>100</sup>	5,336	23,872	21,620	9,907
Population 2006 projected <sup>101</sup>	5,708	23,803	21,963	9,877
<b>DEMOGRAPHICS</b>				
Housing Units <sup>102</sup>	2,039	8,550	7,527	3,782
Area – total <sup>103</sup>	2.8 sq. mi.	21.9 sq. mi.	43.04 sq. mi.	5.22 sq. mi.
Area – land <sup>104</sup>	2.1 sq. mi.	21.37 sq. mi.	40.63 sq. mi.	5.18 sq. mi.
Area – water <sup>105</sup>	1.7 sq. mi.	.53 sq. mi.	2.41 sq. mi.	.04 sq. mi.
Density per sq. mile – population <sup>106</sup>	2,207.1	1,174.4	485.3	4,111
Density per sq. mile – housing <sup>107</sup>	965.1	400	185.2	1,558.1
<b>STAFFING COMPUTATIONS</b>				

<sup>99</sup> U.S. Census Bureau (2000). New Jersey – Place and County Subdivision. GCT-PH1. Population, Housing Units, Area and Density: 2000. Data Set: Census 2000. Summary File 1 (SF1) 100-Percent Data. Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=04000US34&-box\\_head\\_nbr=GCT-PH1&-ds\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U&-redoLog=false&-mt\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U\\_GCTPH1\\_ST2&-format=ST-7](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=04000US34&-box_head_nbr=GCT-PH1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-redoLog=false&-mt_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_GCTPH1_ST2&-format=ST-7)

<sup>100</sup> U.S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Criminal Justice Information Services Division. (2006). 2006 – Crime in the United States. Table 8. NEW JERSEY Offenses Known to Law Enforcement by State by City, 2006 Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table\\_08\\_nj.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table_08_nj.html)

<sup>101</sup> U.S. Census Bureau. Population Division. (2007, June 28). Table 4: Annual Estimates of the Population for Incorporated Places in New Jersey, Listed Alphabetically: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006. Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: <http://www.census.gov/popest/cities/tables/SUB-EST2006-05-34.xls>

<sup>102</sup> U.S. Census Bureau (2000). New Jersey – Place and County Subdivision. GCT-PH1. Population, Housing Units, Area and Density: 2000. Data Set: Census 2000. Summary File 1 (SF1) 100-Percent Data. Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=04000US34&-box\\_head\\_nbr=GCT-PH1&-ds\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U&-redoLog=false&-mt\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U\\_GCTPH1\\_ST2&-format=ST-7](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=04000US34&-box_head_nbr=GCT-PH1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-redoLog=false&-mt_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_GCTPH1_ST2&-format=ST-7)

<sup>103</sup> Id.

<sup>104</sup> Id.

<sup>105</sup> Id.

<sup>106</sup> Id.

<sup>107</sup> Id.

	Mt. Arlington	Roxbury	Jefferson	Wharton / Mine Hill (combined)
<b>POPULATION DATA</b>				
<b>NJ average (2.4 per 1000)</b>				
<b>2000 Census</b>	11.19	57.32	47.32	23.94
<b>2006 - FBI / UCR</b>	12.81	57.29	51.89	23.78
<b>2006 - Projected</b>	13.70	57.13	52.71	23.70
<b>National average per BSC (2.6 per 1000)</b>				
<b>2000 Census</b>	12.12	62.1	51.26	25.94
<b>2006 - FBI / UCR</b>	13.87	62.07	56.21	25.76
<b>2006 - Projected</b>	14.84	61.89	57.1	25.68
<b>National average - 2004 (2.8 per 1000)</b>				
<b>2000 Census</b>	13.09	66.87	55.21	27.94
<b>2006 - FBI / UCR</b>	14.94	66.84	60.53	27.74
<b>2006 - Projected</b>	15.98	66.65	61.50	27.66
<b>RANGE</b>				
<b>RANGE</b>	11.19 – 15.98	57.32 – 66.65	47.32 – 61.50	23.94 – 27.66
<b>CURRENT Full-time police officers<sup>108</sup></b>	13	48	39	21
<b>Deviation</b>	-2.98 / +2.81	-9.32 / -18.65	-8.32 / -22.5	-2.94 / -6.66
<b>CRIME RATES</b>				
<b>2006 Violent Crime (per 100,000)<sup>109</sup></b>	75	88	65	40
<b>2006 Property Crime (per 100,000)<sup>110</sup></b>	975	1336	1073	1544
<b>2006 Violent Crime<sup>111</sup></b>	4	24	14	4
<b>2006 Property Crime<sup>112</sup></b>	232	319	52	153

<sup>108</sup> U.S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Criminal Justice Information Services Division. (2006). 2006 – Crime in the United States. Table 78. NEW JERSEY Full-time Law Enforcement Employees by State by City, 2006 Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table\\_78\\_nj.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table_78_nj.html)

<sup>109</sup> As applied to 2006 FBI population data (see table 2).

<sup>110</sup> As applied to 2006 FBI population data (see table 2).

<sup>111</sup> U.S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Criminal Justice Information Services Division. (2006). 2006 – Crime in the United States. Table 8. NEW JERSEY Offenses Known to Law Enforcement by State by City, 2006 Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table\\_08\\_nj.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table_08_nj.html)

<sup>112</sup> Id.

## TABLE 2. CRIME RATE COMPARISON

### 2006 Crime Rate Comparison<sup>113</sup>

City	Population	Violent crime	Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Property crime	Burglary	Larceny-theft	Motor vehicle theft	Arson
Jefferson Township	21,620	14	0	1	6	7	232	67	154	11	2
Mount Arlington	5,336	4	0	0	0	4	52	12	37	3	0
Roxbury Township	23,872	21	0	2	9	10	319	66	229	24	0
Wharton / Mine Hill (combined)	9,907	4	0	1	0	3	153	28	118	7	0

<sup>113</sup> U.S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Criminal Justice Information Services Division. (2006). 2006 – Crime in the United States. Table 8. NEW JERSEY Offenses Known to Law Enforcement by State by City, 2006 Retrieved on October 14, 2007 from: [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table\\_08\\_nj.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/data/table_08_nj.html)

**TABLE 3.  
COMPARISON OF SHARED SERVICE PROVIDERS**

	<b>Mt. Arlington</b>	<b>Roxbury</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>	<b>Wharton</b>
<b>Operational Costs</b>				
<b>Salary / wage</b>	\$1,075,000 <sup>114</sup>		Higher? <sup>115</sup> Exact figure not provided.	
<b>Officer salary</b>	\$ 80,000 <sup>116</sup>	\$89,000 <sup>117</sup>	Higher? <sup>118</sup> Exact figure not provided.	\$89,300 <sup>119</sup>
<b>Medical Benefits</b>	\$18,000 <sup>120</sup> + compensation for any out-of-pocket costs for life. <sup>121</sup>	\$18,000 <sup>122</sup>	Medical benefits for life. Would either accrue after 12 additional years OR would credit prior service but only hire those with up to 3 years experience. <sup>123</sup>	\$18,000 <sup>124</sup>
<b>Pension</b>	\$6,800 <sup>125</sup>	\$7,565 <sup>126</sup>	Unknown	\$7,590 <sup>127</sup>
<b>FICA</b>	\$6,120 <sup>128</sup>	\$6,808 <sup>129</sup>	Unknown	\$6,831 <sup>130</sup>
<b>Average total</b>	\$110,000 <sup>131</sup>	\$121,000 <sup>132</sup>	Unknown	\$121,721 <sup>133</sup>

<sup>114</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 11.

<sup>115</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>116</sup> Id. at p. 11.

<sup>117</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>118</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>119</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>120</sup> Id. at p. 11.

<sup>121</sup> Id. at p. 22.

<sup>122</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>123</sup> Id. at p. 14 – 15.

<sup>124</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>125</sup> Id. at p. 11.

<sup>126</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>127</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>128</sup> Id. at p. 11.

<sup>129</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>130</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>131</sup> Id. at p. 11.

<sup>132</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>133</sup> Id. at p. 21.

	<b>Mt. Arlington</b>	<b>Roxbury</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>	<b>Wharton</b>
<b>Projected Base Cost</b>		\$726,000 for six officers <sup>134</sup>	Unknown	\$1,217,210 + dispatch <sup>135</sup>
<b>Benefits and Disadvantages</b>				
<b>Location</b>		Contiguous <sup>136</sup>	Contiguous <sup>137</sup>	3 miles away <sup>138</sup>
<b>Access</b>		Howard Blvd. near Route 80 bypass. <sup>139</sup>	Intersection of Howard Blvd. and Minisink Road. <sup>140</sup>	Three roadways provide ingress <sup>141</sup>
<b>Patrol</b>		Four (4) squads, six (6) officers per <sup>142</sup>	Four (4) squads, six (6) officers per <sup>143</sup>	Four officer squads IF acquire Mt. Arlington shared services agreement. <sup>144</sup>
<b>Minimum staffing levels</b>		Four (4) officers per uniform patrol shift <sup>145</sup>	Four (4) officers per uniform patrol shift <sup>146</sup>	Three (3) officers per uniform patrol shift IF acquire Mt. Arlington shared services agreement <sup>147</sup>
<b>Overtime to cover staff shortages</b>	Yes; 105 hours in 2006. <sup>148</sup>	Yes <sup>149</sup>	Yes <sup>150</sup>	
<b>Additional Officers to</b>		Six (6), could hire an	Six (6) <sup>152</sup>	Ten (10) <sup>153</sup>

<sup>134</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>135</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>136</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>137</sup> Id. at p. 13.

<sup>138</sup> Id. at p. 19 and p. 22.

<sup>139</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>140</sup> Id. at p. 13.

<sup>141</sup> Id. at p. 13.

<sup>142</sup> Id. at p. 17.

<sup>143</sup> Id. at p. 13 – 14.

<sup>144</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>145</sup> Id. at p. 17.

<sup>146</sup> Id. at p. 13 – 14.

<sup>147</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>148</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com)

<sup>149</sup> Id. at p. 17, see also p. 14.

<sup>150</sup> Id. at p. 14.

	<b>Mt. Arlington</b>	<b>Roxbury</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>	<b>Wharton</b>
<b>cover Mt. Arlington territory</b>		additional two (2) to fill retirement slots in next three years. <sup>151</sup>		
<b>Civil Service Examination</b>			Not required. <sup>154</sup>	
<b>Communication Center</b>	Will pay \$93,310 for dispatch in 2007 <sup>155</sup>	No additional fee for service <sup>156</sup>	No additional fee for service <sup>157</sup>	To be provided by Morris County Dispatch; fee unknown <sup>158</sup>
<b>Community Policing</b>	Yes <sup>159</sup>	Yes <sup>160</sup>	Yes <sup>161</sup>	
<b>DARE</b>	Yes <sup>162</sup>	Yes <sup>163</sup>	Yes <sup>164</sup>	Yes <sup>165</sup>
<b>Emergency Medical Services Unit (ESU)</b>		Yes <sup>166</sup>		
<b>Motorcycle Patrol Unit</b>		Yes <sup>167</sup>		
<b>Dive Team</b>		Yes <sup>168</sup>		
<b>SWAT Team</b>		Yes <sup>169</sup>		
<b>Traffic Unit</b>		Yes <sup>170</sup>		Yes <sup>171</sup>
<b>School</b>		Yes <sup>172</sup>		

<sup>152</sup> Id. at p. 14.

<sup>153</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>151</sup> Id. at p. 17.

<sup>154</sup> Id. at p. 14.

<sup>155</sup> Id. at p. 26.

<sup>156</sup> Id. at p. 18.

<sup>157</sup> Id. at p. 15.

<sup>158</sup> Id. at p. 22.

<sup>159</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>160</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 17 and 18.

<sup>161</sup> Id. at p. 15.

<sup>162</sup> Anonymous. (2007, October 15). Email forwarded by Dave Rubenstein of [www.savemapd.com](http://www.savemapd.com).

<sup>163</sup> Blue Shield Consultants. (2007, October 10). Analysis of police shared services agreement for Borough of Mt. Arlington, p. 17 and 18.

<sup>164</sup> Id. at p. 15.

<sup>165</sup> Id. at p. 22.

<sup>166</sup> Id. at p. 17 and p. 18.

<sup>167</sup> Id.

<sup>168</sup> Id.

<sup>169</sup> Id.

<sup>170</sup> Id.

<sup>171</sup> Id. at p. 21.

	<b>Mt. Arlington</b>	<b>Roxbury</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>	<b>Wharton</b>
<b>Resource Officers</b>				
<b>Detective Bureau</b>	Yes <sup>173</sup>	Yes; 65% clearance rate <sup>174</sup>		Yes <sup>175</sup>
<b>Experienced Chief of Police</b>	Yes	Yes <sup>176</sup>	Yes <sup>177</sup>	Yes <sup>178</sup>
<b>Mt. Arlington Police Station</b>		Not Needed; possible savings of \$62,500 if rented. <sup>179</sup>	Not Needed; possible savings of \$62,500 if rented. <sup>180</sup> – offset by unspecified added expenditure to expand current undersized police station? <sup>181</sup>	Needed <sup>182</sup>
<b>Policing Style</b>	Unspecified.	Different from MAPD <sup>183</sup>	Different from MAPD <sup>184</sup>	Same as MAPD <sup>185</sup>
<b>Additional uniform change/gear</b>		One-time purchase needed at unknown cost <sup>186</sup>	One-time purchase needed at unknown cost <sup>187</sup>	One-time purchase needed at unknown cost <sup>188</sup>
<b>Infrastructure Change</b>		Unspecified cost for		

<sup>172</sup> Id.

<sup>173</sup> Rubenstein, D. (2007, October 18). Email correspondence.

<sup>174</sup> Id.

<sup>175</sup> Id. at p. 21.

<sup>176</sup> Id.

<sup>177</sup> Id. at p. 13 and p. 15.

<sup>178</sup> Id. at p. 20 – 21.

<sup>179</sup> Id. at p. 18 and p. 23

<sup>180</sup> Id. at p. 18 and p. 23

<sup>181</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>182</sup> Id. at p. 21 – 22.

<sup>183</sup> Id. at p. 19.

<sup>184</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>185</sup> Id. at p. 22.

<sup>186</sup> Id. at p. 19.

<sup>187</sup> Id. at p. 16.

<sup>188</sup> Id. at p. 22.

	<b>Mt. Arlington</b>	<b>Roxbury</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>	<b>Wharton</b>
		change to Township Locker room <sup>189</sup>		
<b>Police Vehicles</b>	Eight (8) police vehicles, year unknown. Value brand new & equipped = \$35,000 per. Unknown current valuation. <sup>190</sup>			
<b>JOINT Municipal Court</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>SHARED Municipal Court</b>	Term of Judge of Municipal Court will not be completed until December, 2009; may be unspecified savings from reduction of personnel. <sup>191</sup>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

---

<sup>189</sup> Id.

<sup>190</sup> Id. at p. 24.

<sup>191</sup> Id. at 12.