



LEGISLATIVE ANALYST REPORT

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors
From: Gabe Cabrera, Office of the Legislative Analyst (OLA)
Date: April 19, 2007
Re: **Neighborhood Watch** (BOS File No. 070252) (OLA No. 016-07)

SUMMARY OF REQUESTED ACTION

The Board of Supervisors approved a motion introduced by Supervisor Mirkarimi requesting the OLA to analyze the City's Neighborhood Watch program as administered by San Francisco SAFE Inc., and to compare it with neighborhood watch (NW) in other cities. Specifically:

- How are NW programs created, designated and maintained?
- Who approves installation of neighborhood NW signs?
- Are there parameters that describe active and inactive NW groups? Also, who maintains a list of active NW groups?
- Do NW groups receive public or private funding?
- Are there standard procedures for relationships between NW groups and the police?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The OLA's research was conducted in three phases. First, the OLA examined the research literature on NW to gather information about its history, structures and operations in the United States. Second, the OLA identified a sample of six programs with varying approaches to NW. Notably, three of the six programs have received the National Sheriffs Association's award for "Outstanding Neighborhood Watch", which is described later in this report. Third, the OLA compared the characteristics (i.e., administrative, operational and environmental) of the City's NW program with those of successful NW programs in other jurisdictions.

The OLA discovered that NW programs are typically administered by either law enforcement agencies (i.e., police or sheriffs' departments) or non-profit crime prevention organizations. Currently, San Francisco SAFE, Inc. (SF SAFE) (a non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation) runs the City's NW program. The OLA also discovered that at least some successful NW programs in other cities require NW groups to attend monthly meetings at NW headquarters to report their activities and learn what other groups are doing. There is no such requirement of NW groups in San Francisco.

The OLA identified a sample of six programs with varying approaches to NW. Table 1 on the following page summarizes their responses to key questions raised by the sponsor of this request.

Table 1: Highlights of NW Programs							
Jurisdiction	Agency	No. of NW Groups	Formal Criteria for Active NW Groups?	NW Street Signs		Funding for NW Groups?	
				<i>Installation</i>	<i>Cost to NW group</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Source</i>
Los Angeles, CA (county)	Sheriff's dept.	23	Check-ins at monthly mtgs. btwn. CLEPP* and district stations	Public Works dept.	\$0	Varies	Fund-raising events
Miami-Dade, FL (county)	Non-profit	12,000	Check-ins at annual NW event	NW group	\$0	Varies	State grants and local taxes
Niagara Falls, NY (city)	Volunteer org.	33	Check-ins at monthly council meetings	Public Works dept.	\$0	Up to \$3,000/yr	State and local grants
Oakland, CA (city)	Police dept.	400	Check-ins at monthly NCPC** meetings	Public Works dept.	\$0	Up to \$700/yr	Police dept. thru NCPCs
San Francisco, CA (city/county)	Non-profit	333	Work in progress	DPT	\$37.50/sign	Varies	Local grants
San Jose, CA (city)	Police dept.	96	Work in progress	Trans. Dept.	\$0	Varies	State and local grants
Spokane, WA (county)	Sheriff's dept.	1,225	Check-ins during qtrly. Sheriff's newsletter distributions	Roads dept.	\$5/sign	Varies	HOAs***

* *Community/Law Enforcement Partnership Program (CLEPP) of the Sheriff's Department*
 ** *Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils or NCPCs are united NW groups. There are 51 NCPCs citywide.*
 *** *Home Owner Associations (HOA)*

BACKGROUND

In 1972, the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA) created the National Neighborhood Watch Program to unite law enforcement agencies and individual citizens in an effort to reduce residential crime. Since its establishment, the program has spawned literally thousands of local NW programs in which participants work to make their homes and families less inviting targets for crime and cooperate with law enforcement agencies through block and neighborhood groups.

The essence of NW is "observe and report" (otherwise known as informal surveillance). When NW is implemented, participants make a commitment to be more watchful during regular daily activities. Law enforcement agencies typically instruct participants about cues associated with suspicious situations. When they detect such cues, they are to note the details and notify the police immediately. The existence of NW is announced by signs erected at strategic points in

the area. However, informal surveillance is not the only activity that NW groups engage in. A seminal US Department of Justice survey/report on 550 NW programs nationwide¹ revealed that on average, NW groups engage in at least two additional activities, and the range of activities is diverse, as follows:

- Project/operation identification, wherein residents engrave their property with ID numbers (81%);
- Home security surveys (68%);
- Crime tip hotline (38%);
- Street lighting improvement (35%);
- Victim/witness assistance (19%);
- Organized surveillance, such as citizen foot patrols (12%);
- Emergency telephones (5%);
- Project whistle stop (3%);
- Specialized informal surveillance, such as “vacation watch” and “funeral watch” when residents are temporarily away from their homes (3%);
- Escort service (2%); and
- Telephone chain (1%).

NW Effectiveness

The existing evidence concerning the impact of NW on crime is encouraging but far from conclusive.² It suggests that NW can produce declines in property crime, especially residential burglary. For instance, one study shows that census tracts in which the Seattle Community Crime Prevention Program operated had a 36% reduction in residential burglary from 1974 to 1975, while adjacent control tracts experienced only a 5% decline.³ However, another study found that based on victimization surveys in 1984 and 1985, three of four NW areas in Chicago had no changes in their residential burglary victimization rates relative to changes in the comparison areas.⁴ Still, the sheer number of studies claiming to show crime reductions from NW convinced the authors of the aforementioned Justice Department survey/report that “NW programs are having some preventative effects on crime in some places, although the effects are probably not nearly as large as they are often touted to be.”⁵ For the purposes of this analysis, the OLA accepts, as a working assumption, that NW has some positive effects in preventing crime, particularly residential burglary.

CURRENT LAW & PRACTICE

San Francisco SAFE, Inc. (Safety Awareness for Everyone)

¹ Garafalo and McLeod, *Improving the Effectiveness and Utilization of Neighborhood Watch Programs*, National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice, June 1987.

² Most effectiveness studies were performed in the 1980's, but their validity remains widely accepted by professionals.

³ Garafalo and McLeod, 1987.

⁴ Garafalo and McLeod, 1987.

⁵ Garafalo and McLeod, 1987.

San Francisco SAFE, Inc. is a non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation that provides crime prevention and public safety services citywide, under a contract agreement with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). In FY 06-07, SAFE's budget totals \$642,124. Of this, \$590,000, or 92%, comes from its contract with the SFPD, as was the case in FY 05-06. Its other funding sources, totaling \$52,124, include: \$10,000 from fees for service (i.e., residential and business security assessments); \$26,951 from other income; and \$15,173 to be fundraised by SF SAFE during the fiscal year. The Attachment to this report, provided by Ms. Cindy Brandon, SF SAFE's Executive Director, contains SAFE's FY 06-07 budget, including total expenses and funding sources.

According to Ms. Brandon, SF SAFE tracks its annual budget by expense categories (i.e., salaries, fringe benefits, operating expenses, etc.), not according to SF SAFE services, such as NW. If the Board of Supervisors wishes to know how much of SF SAFE's budget is dedicated to NW, it should consider asking the City's Budget Analyst and/or Controller's Office to conduct an analysis of SF SAFE's allocation of staff time and resources and to report its findings to the Board.

SF SAFE was originally a SFPD project, when it was created in 1976. At the time, SF SAFE was supported largely with federal funding. According to Ms. Pamela Matsuda, SF SAFE's Program Coordinator, a policy decision was made to restructure SF SAFE in 1980 as a non-profit, when its federal funding ended. That year, SF SAFE entered into its first contract agreement with the Police Department, and applied for and received matching grant funds from Standard Oil of California (now known as the Chevron Corporation). The matching grant appears to have been facilitated by its non-profit status. Despite these changes, SF SAFE's mission has always been the same -- to act as the Police Department's crime prevention component. Specifically, SF SAFE's services and activities include:

- Neighborhood Watch (NW) groups - Helps to organize groups and provides free crime prevention information and materials;
- Business Watch groups - Helps to organize groups of merchants, store owners or managers in the same way as NW groups;
- Personal safety presentations - Provides personal safety presentations for children, youth, adults and the elderly;
- Residential and business security assessments – Provides on-site assessments of homes and businesses, and offers recommendations on how to make them more secure;
- Emergency preparedness - Connects NW and Business Watch groups to training sessions that prepare them for disasters; and
- Community policing activities - Organizes safety events and fairs that give residents and police a chance to get to know each other (a tenet of community policing).

How to Start a NW Group

Forming a Neighborhood Watch group (or Business Watch group) in San Francisco is initially a three-step process.

First step - Any individual concerned about crime in his/her neighborhood recruits two or three neighbors to form a Planning Committee.

Second step - Once the committee is formed, its members contact SF SAFE to assist with the organizing process and problem solving.

Third step - The Planning Committee then meets with a SF SAFE representative to discuss SF SAFE's role, identify public safety issues and concerns, plan and schedule the first NW meeting and create a meeting notification system.

With every group, SF SAFE facilitates a series of at least four NW meetings on a variety of crime prevention and public safety topics.⁶ Ms. Brandon advises that SF SAFE may initially meet more than four times with some groups. This depends on the range of issues a group wants to address. Once groups complete these meetings, SF SAFE officially designates them as NW groups and they begin to organize their own meetings (without SF SAFE's assistance). Incidentally, these meetings also serve as initial proof of the required four meetings per year that NW groups agree to hold in order to be eligible for NW street signs. The SF SAFE application process for NW signs is described later in this report. According to Ms. Brandon, most groups meet monthly, although some meet quarterly or on an as needed basis because every group has its own character, challenges and needs. Ms. Brandon advised the OLA that SF SAFE does not provide funds to individual NW groups, although some have applied for and received grants for NW activities and events from City departments, such as Recreation and Park for neighborhood clean up projects.

SF SAFE Partnerships with City Departments

SF SAFE has partnerships, albeit informal ones, with both the District Attorney (DA) and Superior Court. According to Ms. Matsuda, SF SAFE refers NW groups to the DA's Office of Neighborhood Programs, which may designate a "Community Liaison" to attend regular NW meetings in their own or other neighborhoods where they bring particular expertise around public safety issues. As of the writing of this report the DA's Office of Neighborhood Programs had not yet responded to our request for additional information about its role with respect to NW. Ms. Matsuda advised the OLA that in the past SF SAFE and Court officials have organized "Court Watches" where NW participants observe criminal court proceedings and document how the court system treats the victims of crime.

NW Performance Measures

Both SF SAFE and the Crime Analysis Unit within SFPD's Planning Division advised the OLA that there are currently no performance measures (either quantitative or qualitative) for NW participants to rate their interactions with the SFPD.

⁶ Typically, the first meeting is designed for neighbors to meet one another and discuss/prioritize crime and public safety issues. They also start the process of addressing issues and problem solving. Before the meeting ends, a SF SAFE representative teaches them how to create a telephone and email communication network and how to observe and report suspicious activity and crime. At the next meeting, neighbors report back on any updates for problem solving. They also set goals and/or desired outcomes. In addition, a SF SAFE representative teaches them about best practices/strategies for personal safety and home security. The highlights of the third meeting include meeting a Police Department representative from the nearest District Station and announcing any problem outcomes. At the fourth meeting, neighbors continue to discuss old and new issues, announce any outcomes, define leadership roles and set future meetings.

Some police departments attempting to gauge NW activity by asking NW participants to identify themselves as such when calling them to report something have experienced problems. For instance, at least two police departments told the authors of the aforementioned Justice Department survey/report that they stopped this practice of asking NW participants to identify themselves as such because it was leading some NW participants to expect priority treatment for their calls.⁷

NW Street Signs

To be eligible for a NW street sign(s), SF SAFE requires NW groups to meet the following criteria:

- 50% of the NW group (block) must participate in a block map and project/operation identification;
- Hold at least four meetings per year;
- Agree to maintain the signs; and
- Fill out a SF SAFE application for the City's Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) to install the signs.

SF SAFE pays for and owns the signs, but NW groups must bear the cost to install them. Installation costs vary, but typically total \$37.50 per sign. As initial proof of the required four meetings per year, NW groups must send their meeting sign-in sheets to SF SAFE along with their application to install the signs. The application itself reads that if a group fails to comply with the above criteria, its signs will be removed. However, according to Ms. Matsuda, to date, neither SF SAFE nor DPT has removed any NW signs. This is likely because SF SAFE does not have a mechanism in place to verify that NW groups actually hold the required four meetings per year beyond the first four meetings facilitated by SF SAFE. One possible solution is for SF SAFE to require groups to submit their sign-in sheets annually. As of the writing of this report, SF SAFE was tabulating the exact number of NW signs in San Francisco. However, Ms. Matsuda estimates conservatively that there are approximately 400 NW signs citywide.

Number of NW Groups

Since FY 00-01, SF SAFE has started 333 NW groups, as measured by the initial series of at least four NW meetings facilitated by SF SAFE. According to Ms. Brandon, SF SAFE has not entered information about the number of groups started before FY 00-01 into its new computer database and therefore that information is not readily available. The Board of Supervisors may wish to urge SF SAFE to enter pre-FY 00-01 information about NW groups into its database and thereafter to report the total number of NW groups started by SF SAFE since it was created to the Board.

Moreover, it is unclear how many of the 333 NW groups citywide are either "active" or "inactive" because, according to Ms. Brandon, once groups complete the initial series of four NW meetings facilitated by SF SAFE, they become largely independent of SF SAFE. SF SAFE does not systematically track their meetings or activities. However, Ms. Brandon points out that

⁷ Garafalo and McLeod, 1987.

SF SAFE has some sense of their levels of activity because they often ask SF SAFE back for help to address issues or resolve problems.

Castro Community on Patrol (CCOP)

The aforementioned Justice Department survey/report identified 66 NW programs with citizen patrol groups.⁸ Castro Community on Patrol (CCOP) is one such group in San Francisco. Citizens concerned about crime in the City's Castro District created CCOP in October 2006. Working in close collaboration with SF SAFE, some City departments (i.e., Police, District Attorney, etc.) as well as community-based organizations, CCOP aims to create a safer Castro District by training volunteers to walk the area and contact the Police Department when they see suspicious activity. Through their presence, they also help to deter crime. According to Mr. Carlton Paul, CCOP co-founder and current chairman of the CCOP Board of Directors, the group's funds for patrol t-shirts, whistles and other items come mainly from private donations and fundraisers, although it has received grant funds from the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice. Notably, the research literature on NW shows that programs with citizen patrols, like CCOP, are a definite minority. One explanation is that citizen patrols require more participation and volunteerism than traditional NW groups.____

OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Because there is little written research on NW programs, the OLA contacted the National Sheriffs Association (NSA) for help identifying successful NW programs, especially those administered by non-profits, as is the case in San Francisco. Ms. Robbi Woodson of NSA's National Awards Program advised us of three such programs, which are described below in some detail. According to Ms. Woodson, each of these programs has received NSA's award for "Outstanding Neighborhood Watch".⁹

To a lesser degree, the OLA examined three NW programs in California: Los Angeles County, Oakland and San Jose. Their responses to key questions raised by the sponsor of this request are in the Executive Summary of this report.

Miami-Dade County, Florida

Citizens' Crime Watch (CCW) is a private non-profit tax-exempt 501(c)(3) organization created in 1974 by concerned citizens in response to the crime problem in the county. In FY 06-07, CCW's budget totals approximately \$600,000. It is funded mainly by county tax dollars, grants and donations. CCW operates several crime prevention and public safety programs including a successful NW program.¹⁰ According to Ms. Carmen Caldwell, CCW Executive Director, CCW has approximately 12,000 active crime watch groups in a total county population of

⁸ Garafalo and McLeod, 1987.

⁹ Eligible NW programs are those that are innovative, demonstrate excellence and are exemplary in their approach to involving citizens and/or the community in volunteerism. Criteria for eligibility may also include actions taken by NW that prevented criminal activities and made the community safer, such as getting a drug dealer off their street or helping to assist law enforcement in an arrest.

¹⁰ Specifically, this program 1) organizes neighborhoods of single family homes, apartment complexes and gated communities, 2) educates residents in crime prevention, homeland security and natural disasters, 3) establishes working relationships between residents and police and 4) helps to create a telephone chain to communicate with neighbors in times of need.

approximately 2.4 million.¹¹ A group is considered “active” if its members are vigilant with respect to calling the police to report crime and if they stay in close contact with their “Community Resource Officer” (a corresponding police officer for the area). They are also required to meet as a group at least two times per year and to participate in CCW’s annual “Citizens’ Stand Against Crime” event.

To form a new group, typically one resident organizes the first meeting between neighbors, a CCW representative and a Community Resource Officer to immediately begin addressing whatever issue the neighborhood has. By default, this resident becomes the “Neighborhood Chairperson” (at least temporarily). At least 30% neighborhood participation is suggested for a viable group. Before the meeting ends, the Chairperson sets up a “Telephone Chain” and the group as a whole elects “Block Captains”. Once the group is organized, the Chairperson assigns someone to install NW signs, with the county’s prior approval, at key entrances to the neighborhood. There is no cost to neighbors for these signs. Also, the Chairperson or a member attends monthly meetings at CCW’s main office to report their activities and learn what other groups are doing.

Spokane County, Washington

The Spokane County Sheriff’s Office (SCSO) began the county’s NW program in 1979. In FY 06-07, the program’s budget totals approximately \$11,000, most of which comes from a federal Citizen Corps grant. There are currently 1,225 active groups in a total county population of approximately 441,000. Ms. Diana Somerville, SCSO’s NW Coordinator, states that watch groups engage in different levels of activity because their neighborhoods have different needs and challenges. However, SCSO advises groups to meet at least two times per year to update their “Neighborhood Map” which portrays who lives where as well as to welcome new neighbors.¹² Also, Ms. Somerville periodically informs groups, via email correspondence, about current crime data by area, and SCOPE (Sheriff’s Community Oriented Policing Effort) volunteers “check-in” with NW organizers when they distribute quarterly SCSO newsletters from SCOPE station areas.

New NW groups are started when one or more citizens concerned about crime in their neighborhood attend a NW “Organizer Training Session” where they learn about the program. NW trainees/organizers then go back to their neighborhoods and conduct their own meeting. The purpose of the meeting is twofold: for neighbors to get to know one another and to distribute crime prevention materials. A Sheriff deputy that works in the area may be invited to attend. With the help of neighbors, NW trainees/organizers create the above-noted Neighborhood Map and forward a copy of it to SCSO’s Neighborhood Watch Coordinator. With a \$10 donation to the NW program, new groups receive two NW street signs and additional crime prevention materials. Some groups receive funds from their neighborhood/home owner associations for this expense, according to Ms. Somerville.

City of Niagara Falls, New York

¹¹ A computer database helps CCW to track information about each group and their members (i.e., names, street addresses, etc.).

¹² At a minimum, Neighborhood Maps should contain the names of occupants, street addresses and telephone numbers.

Established in 1992, the Niagara Falls Block Club Council (NFBC) is a volunteer-based crime watch organization.¹³ Its primary purpose is to unite block clubs established in the City of Niagara Falls, New York.¹⁴ According to Mr. Roger Spurbach, NFBC President, the Council presently consists of 33 active block clubs in the city. The city's total population is approximately 54,000. The Council meets on a monthly basis to discuss crime prevention and public safety strategies. Individual block clubs are considered active if their members attend monthly Council meetings, and if they organize at least one NW meeting per month in their own neighborhoods. When available, NFBC awards block clubs up to \$3,000 annually in state and local "pass through" grants for special NW projects such as "pocket parks" (e.g., mini-park areas with environmental rather than recreational importance).

Any individual may contact the Niagara Falls Police or Sheriff regarding the formation of a block club. Both agencies are available to assist. This individual then organizes a first meeting between neighbors to identify their most pressing problems (e.g., crime, housing, litter, etc.), and to assign people to learn about each problem. At the next meeting, neighbors report back, discuss possible solutions and draw up a plan of action giving everyone a job to do (e.g., clean-up vacant lots, help paint a needy neighbor's house, etc.). Thereafter, the block club meets on a monthly basis. A representative from law enforcement is typically invited to attend these meetings. Moreover, the Council, through the city's Department of Public Works, installs NW street signs at no cost to the neighbors. However, neighbors are required to report crime in their area by filling out a "Criminal Activity" sheet and faxing it to their nearest police or sheriff station.

DISCUSSION

The following summarizes some of the major characteristics (e.g., administrative, operational and environmental) of the City's Neighborhood Watch program and those of other NW programs surveyed.

Administrative Characteristics

Crime prevention units within law enforcement agencies administer NW in almost all of the programs surveyed. The advantage to this approach is that NW may be an integrated part of the department's functions. However, crime prevention units are often staffed minimally and have low priorities for resources. Also, there is a perception in law enforcement ranks that crime prevention is not "real police work". Non-profits run NW in the other jurisdictions surveyed, as is the case in San Francisco. Programs that are administered by non-law enforcement agencies can generally give more focused attention to NW than can crime prevention units within law enforcement agencies. Also, they can recruit staff based on the skills and temperament needed for community organizing, rather than other qualities required of a good police officer or sheriff's deputy. However, these agencies lack the aura of authority possessed by law enforcement. This may be a benefit in some neighborhoods where distrust of law enforcement

¹³ NFBC is not a non-profit. However, in 1996, it began partnering with a non-profit housing organization in order to be eligible for and receive various state and local grants.

¹⁴ Through unification, NFBC develops new block clubs, works for improved neighborhood living conditions, creates projects for the Council and block clubs and applies for available grants.

runs deep, but most NW representatives interviewed for this report said NW groups want visible support from law enforcement agencies.

Operational Characteristics

All of the programs surveyed, including San Francisco, have established criteria for individual citizens to meet before they are recognized officially as a NW group. The process of being assessed vis-à-vis the criteria is called certification. Certification criteria vary among jurisdictions, but all of them are meant as indicators of commitment to NW. Furthermore, in some programs, citizens are required to meet additional ongoing criteria in order to retain their NW group status. For instance, programs in Los Angeles County, Niagara Falls and Oakland require NW groups to attend monthly meetings at NW headquarters to report their activities and learn what other groups are doing. There is no such requirement of NW groups in San Francisco.¹⁵ The Board of Supervisors may wish to urge SF SAFE to adopt a similar meeting requirement (neighborhood-wide or citywide) as a mechanism to determine how many of the at least 333 NW groups in San Francisco are either active or inactive. It could also urge SF SAFE to adopt recertification procedures for NW groups. However, a rigorous recertification process might decrease the likelihood that groups will form or be maintained.

Environmental Characteristics

The aforementioned Justice Department survey/report found that NW areas have a high proportion of single-family homes (79%), most of which are owner-occupied (79%). Also, the population of NW areas is predominately white (75%) and disproportionately upper-income (40%). Information about NW areas in San Francisco was unavailable as of the writing of this report. Still, the Justice Department's findings appear to be consistent with research on the relationship between neighborhood characteristics and community organization. In at least one study, researchers found that "low socio-economic status, more heterogeneous neighborhoods where crime related problems are greatest had less success in initiating NW, despite greater efforts by organizers."¹⁶ This suggests that where barriers to NW formation exist, organizers must address other neighborhood problems. Both law enforcement agencies and non-profit crime prevention organizations that offer referrals, and sometimes advocacy, in helping with problems, such as trash pick-up and street repair, can aid in the formation of NW groups. The Niagara Falls Block Club Council might serve as a model for SF SAFE if it decides to expand its scope of activities. For instance, the Council reports residential and commercial properties that are in need of attention due to municipal code violations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

¹⁵ The authors of the aforementioned Justice Department survey/report state that generally speaking, greater NW participation is better (in this case, participation in jurisdiction-wide NW meetings), although there is no evidence upon which to judge the "minimum" amount of participation need to make NW effective. They suggest that the minimum probably varies.

¹⁶ Garafalo and McLeod, 1987.

Although evaluations of NW have come to conflicting conclusions, the OLA assumed, like prior researchers, that it has some positive effects in preventing crime, particularly residential burglary. Furthermore, the OLA identified six programs with varying approaches to NW and compared them with San Francisco's approach. Without exception, each of these programs employs the same basic NW model that requires individual citizens to "observe and report" suspicious activity to local law enforcement. The biggest difference among programs surveyed is the extent to which they engage NW organizers after they have been officially designated a NW group. In San Francisco, once a group completes a series of initial NW meetings, SF SAFE does not systematically monitor its meetings or activities. Thus, SF SAFE cannot gauge which groups are either active or inactive. Nor can SF SAFE determine whether interest in NW is flagging. To maintain interest, participation and activity, the Board of Supervisors may wish to urge SF SAFE to establish monthly or quarterly meetings (neighborhood-wide or citywide) at SF SAFE headquarters for NW groups to report their activities and learn what other groups are doing. This would also serve as a mechanism to determine commitment to NW. Ms. Brandon advised the OLA that establishing these meetings may require additional staff time and resources apart from what already exists in SF SAFE's FY 06-07 budget.

**SAN FRANCISCO SAFE INC.
Proposed Budget for FY 2006-2007**

	<u>2005/2006</u>	<u>2006/2007</u>
<u>INCOME:</u>		
SFPD Contract	\$ 590,000	\$ 590,000
Fee for Service (Res & Bus Sec.)	\$ 10,014	\$ 10,000
Other Income	\$ 44,165	\$ 26,951
Total Income:	<u>\$ 644,179</u>	<u>\$ 626,951</u>
Amount to Fundraise for 06/07		<u>\$ 15,173</u>
Total Income 06/07:		<u><u>\$ 642,124</u></u>
<u>EXPENSES:</u>		
<u>SALARIES:</u>		
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	66,300	66,300
PROGRAM COORDINATOR	54,892	54,892
OFFICE MANAGER	38,250	38,250
CRIME PREVENTION SPECIALISTS (5)	193,417	193,417
SECURITY SPECIALISTS (2)	87,315	87,315
TOTAL SALARIES	<u>440,174</u>	<u>440,174</u>
<u>FRINGE BENEFITS:</u>		
FICA EXPENSE	33,597	33,700
STATE UNEMP INS	4,000	4,000
WORKERS COMPENSATION	13,000	6,000
EMPLOYEE INSURANCE	58,000	77,000
TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	<u>108,597</u>	<u>120,700</u>
<u>OPERATING EXPENSES:</u>		
COPY MACHINE	4,900	7,000
EQUIPMENT	2,000	1,000
EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	350	400
LIABILITY INSURANCE	5,500	10,000
MEMBERSHIPS & FEES	500	1,200
NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH SIGNS	500	
POSTAGE	4,000	2,500
PRINTING	3,000	3,000
SUPPLIES & PUBL	3,000	1,000
TELECOM/INTERNET	2,800	2,900
TRAININGS	2,000	2,000
TOTAL OFFICE EXPENSES	<u>28,550</u>	<u>31,000</u>
<u>TRAVEL:</u>		
FAST PASS		2,160
		9,090
PARKIN G MILEAGE		2,400
TOTAL TRAVEL	<u>9,500</u>	<u>13,650</u>
<u>CONTRACT SERVICES:</u>		
BOOKKEEPING/PR SERVICES	12,600	13,800
PAYROLL SERVICES	3,400	3,800
COMPUTER SERVICES	1,800	10,000
CONSULTANT SERVICES		2,000
AUDIT	5,000	7,000
TOTAL CONTRACT SERVICES	<u>22,800</u>	<u>36,600</u>

TOTAL EXPENSES

\$ 609,621

\$ 642,124