

**REPORT OF THE
CRIME PREVENTION UNIT
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES**

**FEASIBILITY STUDY OF
ESTABLISHING A SAFER BY DESIGN
COMMUNITY RECOGNITION PROGRAM**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 33

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1994**



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

General Assembly Building

FREDERICK L. RUSSELL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

December 14, 1993

TO: The Honorable L. Douglas Wilder, Governor of Virginia,
and Members of the General Assembly:

MEMBERS
FROM THE SENATE OF VIRGINIA:
ELMO G. CROSS, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN
VIRGIL H. GOODE, JR.
EDGAR S. ROBB

FROM THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES:
ROBERT B. BALL, SR., CHAIRMAN
JAMES F. ALMAND
JEAN W. CUNNINGHAM
V. THOMAS FOREHAND, JR.
RAYMOND R. GUEST, JR.
CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR:
ROBERT C. BOBB
ROBERT F. HORAN, JR.
GEORGE F. RICKETTS, SR.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
H. LANE KNEEDLER

House Joint Resolution 617, agreed to by the 1993 General Assembly, directed the Virginia State Crime Commission to study the feasibility of establishing a safer by design community recognition program and to submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 1994 session of the General Assembly.

In fulfilling this directive, a study was conducted by the Virginia State Crime Commission in 1993. I have the honor of submitting herewith the study report and recommendations on a safer by design community recognition program.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Ball, Sr.
Chairman

RBB:sc

This report was produced by the

Crime Prevention Unit
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Director
James E. Kouten, Division Director
Patrick D. Harris, Unit Manager

For further information contact:

Jay W. Malcan, Ph.D.
Crime Prevention Unit
Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-7980

STUDY OF A SAFER BY DESIGN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Authority for Study	1
II.	Members Appointed to Serve.....	1
III.	Executive Summary	2
IV.	Study Goals and Objectives	5
V.	Proposed Model for a Safer By Design Community Program	5
	A. Purpose of a Safer By Design Program	5
	B. Current Issues Related to Program Development	6
	C. Overview of Selected Certification and Recognition Programs in Virginia	8
	D. Process Used to Develop a Proposed Program	10
	E. Community Programming Requirements	11
	F. Community Recognition Process	11
	G. Administrative Requirements	15
VI.	Findings and Recommendations	18
VII.	Acknowledgments	20
	Appendix A - House Joint Resolution 617	A-1
	Appendix B - Certified Business Community Standards.....	B-1
	Appendix C - Virginia Main Street Program	C-1
	Appendix D - Virginia Crime Prevention Association Focus Group Participants	D-1

STUDY OF A SAFER BY DESIGN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY PROGRAM

I. Authority for Study

During the 1993 General Assembly session, Delegate Jean W. Cunningham of Richmond successfully patroned House Joint Resolution 617, directing the "Virginia State Crime Commission oversee a study by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, Crime Prevention Unit, assisted by the Virginia Crime Prevention Association, to determine a method of recognizing communities that utilize crime prevention strategies to improve the quality of community life." HJR 617 specifically requested the "study should determine (i) the standards for recognition, the criteria and procedure for certifying communities as a 'Safer By Design Virginia Community,' (ii) a mechanism for application and review, and (iii) methods to encourage communities to participate in the program." The full text of HJR 617 is provided in Appendix A.

Section 9-125 of the Code of Virginia establishes and directs the Virginia State Crime Commission "To study, report, and make recommendations on all areas of public safety and protection." Section 9-127 of the Code of Virginia provides that "the Commission shall have the duty and power to make such studies and gather information in order to accomplish its purpose, as set forth in Section 9-125, and to formulate its recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly."

Section 9-170 (26) of the Code of Virginia provides that the Department of Criminal Justice Services shall have the duty and power to "define, develop, organize, encourage, conduct, coordinate, and administer programs, projects and activities for the Commonwealth and units of general local government, or combinations thereof, in the Commonwealth, designed to strengthen and improve law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice at every level throughout the Commonwealth".

II. Members Appointed to Serve

At the April 20, 1993, meeting of the Crime Commission, Chairman Robert B. Ball, Sr., of Henrico selected Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum to serve as Chairman of the Law Enforcement Subcommittee providing oversight to the Department of Criminal

Justice Services' study of safer by design programs. The following members of the Crime Commission were selected to serve on the subcommittee:

Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum, Chairman
Mr. Robert C. Bobb
Senator Elmo G. Cross, Jr.
Mr. Robert F. Horan, Jr.
Mr. H. Lane Kneedler
Rev. George F. Ricketts, Sr.
Senator Edgar S. Robb

III. Executive Summary

During the 1993 General Assembly session, Delegate Jean W. Cunningham patroned HJR 617. The resolution called for the Crime Commission to oversee a Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) study of a possible Safer By Design Community Program, a proposed program to recognize communities utilizing crime prevention strategies to improve the quality of community life.

The study of Safer By Design was proposed to Delegate Cunningham and the Governor's Commission on Violent Crime by the Virginia Crime Prevention Association (VCPA). The concept of Safer By Design is modeled after the Certified Business Community Program, sponsored by the Department of Economic Development (DED). The DED program assists localities in attracting new industries based on implementing a set of community programs and services deemed to be conducive to attracting new business. Safer By Design would similarly recognize communities implementing a combination of crime prevention programs and practices.

As stipulated in the resolution, the study was conducted by the DCJS Crime Prevention Unit, with the assistance of the VCPA. The nearly 500 member association is composed of both public and private crime prevention professionals, as well as interested citizens. In addition to background research conducted by DCJS staff in support of the study, the VCPA sponsored a focus group to address the study objectives and two other related issues. The focus group took place July 14-16, 1993.

The Crime Commission was briefed on the plans for the study on April 20, 1993. Additionally, briefings on the study's progress were made by DCJS staff to the Law Enforcement Subcommittee on May 25, 1993; July 27, 1993; September 21, 1993; and October 18, 1993.

The findings and recommendations are as follows:

Finding 1: Establishing a Safer By Design Program holds a lot of promise for making the delivery of crime prevention services a lot more comprehensive and professional at the local level. Designed through the joint efforts of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association and the Department of Criminal Justice Services, the proposed program would be very detailed. It would involve substantial resources to administer it and substantial efforts for most localities to comply with the program's requirements. However, the proposed program would have the potential of providing a readily available blueprint for the delivery of state-of-the-art crime prevention services by localities.

Recommendation 1: The Virginia State Crime Commission endorse the concept of establishing a Safer By Design Community Recognition Program.

Finding 2: It was estimated a Safer By Design Program would require an annual funding level of \$ 100,000. Four possible sources of funding were explored and evaluated: General Fund appropriation, federal grants, state income tax form check-off, and a surcharge on insurance premiums. There is a precedent for an insurance premium surcharge being used to fund a crime prevention program. Section 38.2-414 of the Code of Virginia is presently used to fund the *Help Eliminate Auto Theft* Fund (HEAT Fund). Whatever mechanism is used to fund the Safer By Design Program, it will be imperative to the program's success to fund it at an adequate level.

Recommendation 2: An adequate level of funding will be necessary to ensure localities are provided with the technical assistance and support services they will require to be successful in achieving recognition as a Safer By Design Community.

Finding 3: A Safer By Design Program would recognize localities for implementing comprehensive crime prevention services. Development, implementation and administration of the program would be an appropriate activity for the Department of Criminal Justice Services. Additionally, if SJR 262 leads to the establishment of the Virginia Crime Prevention Center within DCJS, the program would fit well with the proposed mission of the center.

Recommendation 3: If implemented, the Safer By Design Program should be administered by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, and by the Virginia Crime Prevention Center, if established.

Finding 4: As outlined in HJR 617, this study was completed with the assistance of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association. The VCPA provided invaluable assistance, including hosting the focus group responsible for designing the program's proposed requirements and operations. The VCPA should be included in any future activities related to the development of Safer By Design.

Recommendation 4: If implemented, the Safer By Design Program should be administered with the assistance of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association.

Finding 5: There are many developments currently taking place that intimately affect the proposed Safer By Design Program. Establishment of the Crime Prevention Specialist in the Code of Virginia during the 1993 Session of the General Assembly and the publishing of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association's Crime Prevention Standards are the two most important of these developments. Both the specialist and standards would be major components of the proposed program, and localities should be encouraged to pursue them until Safer By Design can be implemented.

Recommendation 5: Until a Safer By Design Program can be established, localities should be encouraged to implement the Virginia Crime Prevention Association's Crime Prevention Standards and have law enforcement personnel certified as Crime Prevention Specialists.

IV. Study Goals and Objectives

Based upon the requirements of HJR 617, the following issues were addressed by DCJS and the VCPA:

- Exploration of alternative models available for a Safer By Design Program;
- Articulation of the criteria for recognizing or certifying communities;
- Development of suggested procedures for the application, review, designation and recertification of communities as Safer By Design communities;
- Review possible methods and incentives to encourage communities to participate in the program;
- Development of alternative sources of funding for implementation of the program; and
- Formulation of recommendations.

V. Proposed Model for a Safer By Design Community Program

A. Purpose of a Safer By Design Program

The purpose of a Safer By Design Program would be to recognize communities implementing an extensive list of crime prevention strategies as a comprehensive program. Presently, many of the crime prevention strategies of interest are already being employed by some localities on an ad hoc basis. The proposed program would require implementation of both a mandatory set of strategies and at least seven of twenty-one optional strategies. Once a locality met these requirements it would be recognized as a “Safer By Design Community.”

This approach to community crime prevention programming is much like the approach used in professional accreditation and certification models. In this program localities will be recognized for their success at employing a full range of crime prevention strategies as a comprehensive program.

B. Current Issues Related to Program Development

Five major issues related to crime prevention in Virginia are in the process of being studied or implemented. SJR 263 addresses the feasibility of establishing a Crime Prevention Center, HJR 489 is to recommend remedies to address blighted and deteriorated housing and commercial structures, HJR 593 focuses on crime and violence prevention through community economic stimulation and development, the VCPA recently published standards for crime prevention, and the Criminal Justice Services Board is in the process of promulgating regulations related to Crime Prevention Specialists. These issues will be discussed briefly since each one has the potential to intimately affect a proposed Safer By Design Program.

1. SJR 263 - Crime Prevention Center Feasibility Study

Senator Edgar S. Robb of Albemarle patroned Senate Joint Resolution 263. SJR 263 requests DCJS to "study the feasibility and desirability of establishing a Crime Prevention Center to provide crime prevention assistance to the Commonwealth and its localities." This study will be submitted to the 1994 Session of the General Assembly. The establishment of such a center, its administrative location, funding and staffing levels, could all impact on the implementation and operation of a Safer By Design Program.

2. HJR 489 - Blighted Housing and Commercial Structures

Delegate Whittington W. Clement of Danville patroned House Joint Resolution 489. HJR 489 requests the Virginia Housing Study Commission "study and recommend remedies to address blighted and deteriorated housing and commercial structures." Remedies developed to deal with blighted and deteriorated structures would certainly be useful components to a Safer By Design Program.

3. HJR 593 - Crime and Violence Prevention Through Community Economic Stimulation and Development

Delegate Franklin P. Hall of Richmond patroned House Joint Resolution 593. HJR 593 establishes “a joint subcommittee to study crime and violence prevention through community economic stimulation and development.” The subcommittee is to be assisted by the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Department of Criminal Justice Services. The outcome of this study could also have implications for a Safer By Design Program.

4. VCPA Crime Prevention Standards

In July of 1993, the VCPA published Crime Prevention Standards: A Guide for Virginia Law Enforcement Agencies. As stated in the guide, its purpose is to “provide a blueprint for developing a comprehensive, coordinated, community crime prevention program.” Developed by a working group of local, state and national representatives, the 40 standards in the guide embody a major step in advancing crime prevention efforts in Virginia. The guide is viewed as significant to a Safer By Design Program because so many of the crime prevention standards would overlap, parallel or impact on likely program components required at the local level.

During the next year the VCPA will deliver four one-day workshops around the state to familiarize law enforcement agencies with the standards. The guide, and resulting workshops, are seen as an important foundation to a Safer By Design Program.

5. Crime Prevention Specialists

The 1993 Session of the General Assembly enacted Sections 9-173.14 and 9-173.15 of the Code of Virginia. Patroned by Delegate Glen R. Crowshaw of Virginia Beach, these sections give state and local law enforcement agencies the option of designating sworn or civilian staff within their agencies as crime prevention specialists. They also direct the Criminal Justice Services Board to “promulgate regulations establishing minimum standards for certification of crime prevention specialists.”

While the code change became effective on July 1, 1993, regulations promulgated by the Board, in compliance with the requirements of the Administrative Process Act (APA), will not be effective until July 1, 1994. Although in the planning stage at this point, requirements to be designated a crime prevention specialist are expected to be stringent. Having a certified crime prevention specialist within the police or sheriff's department would be an important step for a locality to qualify as a Safer By Design Community. However, the combination of APA requirements and the rigor of the Board's anticipated minimum standards for certification, indicate it will be a while before there is a large pool of certified crime prevention specialists available. This situation has given rise to some concerns about prematurely creating the demand for a program, when a major component of that program can not realistically be satisfied for some time.

C. Overview of Selected Certification and Recognition Programs in Virginia

1. Certified Business Community

The Department of Economic Development (DED) has sponsored the Virginia Community Certification Program for approximately ten years. This sophisticated and complex program is administered by DED's Office of Community and Business Services within its Division of Industrial Development.

The complexity of the program requires two supporting documents; a Virginia Community Certification Program Guide and the Program Coordinator's Manual. The rather extensive guide states the program was developed to assist communities across the Commonwealth to achieve job opportunities and capital investment "by becoming more attractive for the location of industry and related economic development."

Communities desiring to be certified must satisfy 31 mandatory standards spread across seven major categories within eighteen months. An extension of six months is possible. The major program categories include: a local economic development organization, community information requirements, quality of life requirements, a local contact team, financial capability, local existing industry program, and sites and building requirements. The complete list of standards is provided in Appendix B.

Once a community formally applies for certification, DED staff provide technical assistance, training and monitor progress. Of the 71 communities wishing to participate, 40 have been certified and 31 did not qualify for certification. Communities must be recertified after three years in order to maintain their certification. DED estimates it takes approximately one and one-half staff FTEs to support the certification program.

2. Virginia Main Street Program

The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) sponsors the Virginia Main Street Program. As stated in the DHCD Instruction Manual and Application Form, the purpose of the program is to assist smaller cities and towns in revitalizing their downtown areas. The program model was developed by the National Main Street Center, and Virginia is one of 31 states providing the program to 600 communities across the country.

The Main Street Program is a comprehensive revitalization strategy based on a "Four Point Approach." The four points include: organization, promotion, design and economic restructuring. While DHCD administers and provides the technical assistance part of the program, participating localities receive the design assistance component from the Department of Historic Resources (DHR).

To be eligible to participate in the Main Street Program a community must satisfy six requirements. Eligibility criteria range from population requirements, to guaranteeing that a local project manager will be employed for a three year period. The complete list of eligibility requirements is listed in Appendix C.

Six selection considerations are used by DHCD in evaluating the nineteen page application. A locality submitting a successful application is "designated" a Main Street Program participant. The program was started in 1985 with an original cohort of five cities designated as participants. Overall, eighteen cities have been designated for participation. The selection criteria for program participation are listed in Appendix C.

Involvement in the program is for a period of three years. Once a city is designated a program participant, it qualifies for ten categories of program services from DHCD

and DHR during the three year period. Services include such things as training workshops and resource team visits. A complete list of program services is provided in Appendix C.

The Main Street Program is another example of a highly complex and sophisticated program. Its program services budget is \$366,000 (70% DHCD & 30% DHR) for the 1992-94 Biennium. This was a reduction of \$ 76,000 from the previous biennium due to the elimination of the state coordinator's position during budget cutbacks. Although staff involved with the program are also involved in other duties, DHCD estimates the program presently requires two professional FTEs and one-half clerical FTE to administer it. Personnel costs are not included in the program services funding mentioned above.

D. Process Used to Develop a Proposed Program

As outlined in HJR 617, the Virginia Crime Prevention Association assisted the Crime Prevention Unit within DCJS in conducting the study. The nearly 500 member VCPA is the state's professional organization for practitioners, as well as citizens interested in crime prevention. The association has an active program of providing training, technical assistance and leadership. It has been recognized nationally as a model for state crime prevention associations. The VCPA's membership comes from 98 Virginia localities, and is comprised of 54 % law enforcement personnel, 23 % private citizens, 13 % security interests, and 10 % from other criminal justice and governmental agencies.

In addition to background research conducted by DCJS staff in support of the study, the VCPA sponsored a focus group to address the study objectives and two other closely related issues. The focus group was held July 14-16, 1993, and is an example of the strong leadership provided by the association. Fifteen individuals, representing the Crime Commission, the Criminal Justice Services Board, the VCPA, and DCJS, participated in the focus group. Participants representing the association also represented seven localities and one state university. A complete list of participants is provided in Appendix D.

E. Proposed Community Programming Requirements

Possible requirements for the Safer By Design Program were discussed at length by the participants at the VCPA focus group. Criteria used in considering requirements included a mandate to maximize professionalism, reliance on proven crime prevention strategies and the development of a final package that would be realistic to localities.

The group reached consensus on having a combination of mandatory and optional requirements. Mandatory requirements are listed in Figure 1 and the optional requirements are listed in Figure 2. Localities would have to satisfy all mandatory requirements listed in Figure 1, and implement their choice of seven of the the twenty-one programs listed as optional in Figure 2.

F. Proposed Community Recognition Process

While designing the process by which a locality would be recognized, the focus group participants tried to realistically balance the desire for a worthwhile and creditable program against the goal of not creating an overly bureaucratic mechanism. The long service of the participants at both the local and state level was very helpful in addressing this goal. The group also operated on the assumption that DCJS would be the best qualified host agency for any program at the state level. The process designed is a relatively standard one involving notice of intent to participate, submission of application, self-assessment, technical assistance, on-site verification, possible remediation, award, and eventual recertification. While the process is a standard one, that is not to say it is simple or would be cheap to administer. For ease of review the steps in the recognition process are listed in Figure 3.

Figure 1

Mandatory Requirements To Qualify
As A Safer By Design Community

1. Must have a local Community Crime Prevention Council or Coalition.
2. An identifiable staff person (who may have other duties) designated/assigned to crime prevention duties in the law enforcement agency.
3. Neighborhood Watch Program with training and support of watches documented.
4. Community Crime Control Process in place.
 - a. Identifiable/designated group;
 - b. Meets periodically;
 - c. At least one member with 24 hours of CPTED training; and
 - d. Involved in site plan review.
5. Organized distribution of crime prevention literature to citizens.
6. Ability to conduct residential security surveys.
7. Ability to conduct community security and safety assessments.
8. Functional crime analysis capability.
9. School safety assessments.
 - a. Existence of a trained team;
 - b. Memorandum of understanding between the police department and school board; and
 - c. One secondary school inspection completed with written report with findings and recommendations on file.
10. Business Watch.
 - a. Ability to conduct commercial security surveys; and
 - b. Provide training on robbery, fraud and personal safety.

Figure 2

Seven Optional Programs Required
To Qualify As A Safer By Design Community

1. DARE
2. McGruff House
3. Employee Watch
4. TRIAD Program
5. National Night Out
6. Crime Solvers/Stoppers
7. Firearms Buyback Program
8. Crime Prevention Newsletter
9. Juvenile Firesetter Program
10. School Resource Police Officer
11. Annual Crime Prevention Awards
12. Campus Crime Prevention Outreach
13. Victim/Witness Services Program
14. Crime Prevention Speaker's Bureau
15. Athletic League for At-Risk Youth
16. Domestic Violence Response Program
17. Inter-Agency Code Enforcement Team
18. School Violence Prevention Curriculum
19. Youth and/or Adult Habitual Offender Program
20. Cooperative Agreements Between Jurisdictions
21. Contact List and Process for Crime Prevention Liaison with Community Leaders and Groups

Figure 3

Steps In Recognition Process For
A Safer By Design Program

1. Solicitation for applications distributed by DCJS.
2. Application and Program Manual provided by DCJS.
3. Formal application submitted to state by locality.
 - a. Current programs documented by locality;
 - b. Self-assessment of any gaps or weaknesses in programs;
 - c. Identify any programs that need to be added;
 - d. Signify intent to fill any gaps and provide timetable;
 - e. Technical assistance on program implementation provided;
 1. By Department of Criminal Justice Services
 2. By Virginia Crime Prevention Association
 - f. On-site verification by state (Team of 3 to 5); and
 - g. Remediation and correction.
4. Locality recognized as Safer By Design Community.
5. Annual verification and renewal after initial award.
6. Reassessment every five years.

G. Administrative Requirements

1. Staffing

Programs of this nature are very detailed and labor intensive. They require staff support to administer them, provide training and make technical assistance services available. The Certified Business Community Program discussed earlier requires the Department of Economic Development to commit one and one-half FTEs to support the program. The Virginia Main Street Program administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development requires two and one-half FTEs.

It is always difficult to anticipate demand for services and workload when planning a new program. However, the minimum staffing to implement, market and administer the proposed Safer By Design Program is conservatively seen as one professional and one-half clerical FTE. This staffing level would insure the Commonwealth could meet the expectations generated by sponsoring the program. A lower staffing level would run the risk of being an "add on" duty during a period of shrinking resources. This dilemma was faced by the Department of Waste Management's Division of Litter Control and Recycling when it had to eliminate its twelve year old Clean Virginia Awards Program due to cuts in the department's budget.

2. Funding

It is estimated the costs for administering and staffing of a Safer By Design Program would be \$ 100,000 annually. There are four alternatives available for funding these minimum costs. Each alternative will be discussed briefly.

a. General Fund Appropriation

A General Fund appropriation is certainly the most straight forward approach. However, during a period of shrinking budgets it does not appear to be a realistic course of action. DCJS is already struggling to maintain mandated programs and initiatives started, but partially completed.

b. Federal Grant Funds

While federal grant funds could be used in theory, the future funding levels of these criminal justice grant programs are unpredictable. This possible source of funding is complicated additionally by federal restrictions on the proportion of total funding that can be allocated to state programs versus grants to localities. Although the program as proposed would be focused on recognizing local crime prevention efforts, the expenditure would be viewed by the Department of Justice as a state expenditure. Categorized as a state program, it would be competing against federally funded state programs already established.

c. State Income Tax Form Check-Off

A check-off block on the Virginia State Income Tax form is a possible source of funding. However, the generation of funds would be extremely difficult to anticipate. It is also recognized there is a fair amount of reluctance to expand the present list of check-offs.

d. Insurance Surcharge

An insurance premium surcharge is a possible source of funding. The 1991 Session of the General Assembly legislated such a crime prevention related insurance surcharge. Section 38.2-414 of the Code of Virginia created the *Help Eliminate Automobile Theft* Fund (HEAT Fund). The purpose of the program and fund is to “provide funds to establish and operate a statewide program to receive and reward information leading to the arrest of persons who commit motor vehicle theft-related crimes”. Funds are allocated to HEAT by a surcharge formula. The formula requires “each insurer licensed to write insurance coverage as defined in Section 38.2-124 shall, prior to March 1 of each year, pay an assessment equal to one-quarter of one percent of the total direct gross premium income for automobile physical damage insurance other than collision written in the Commonwealth during the preceding year.” The HEAT Fund received \$ 600,000 in its first year from this surcharge.

While activities related to the HEAT Fund are restricted to a very narrow range of crime prevention activities, an insurance surcharge to fund the Safer By Design Program would be applied to the full range of crime prevention strategies and programs. Therefore, the surcharge could logically be applied to any line of insurance encompassing a crime related risk. Since the premium base would be larger than only automobile insurance, the surcharge percentage could be smaller than the one-quarter of one percent surcharge presently required by the HEAT Fund.

3. Incentives for Localities to Participate

A rather detailed and involved set of requirements for localities to meet has been proposed. Meeting the proposed requirements would involve limited work for some localities and substantial work for others. A legitimate concern is what are the incentives for a locality to participate if a Safer By Design Program were to be implemented?

Fear of crime by citizens is always at the top of the list of surveys about quality of life issues. Sometimes the fear of crime by citizens is out of proportion to actual risk. Recognition of a locality as a Safer By Design Community would address the objective crime problem as well as the subjective perceptions citizens have about crime. The impact of such an award would be effective with both the long time resident as well as with economic development.

Another incentive is related to professionalism. Receiving recognition as a Safer By Design Community would be acknowledgment that city or county management and the police or sheriff's department have met rigorous standards related to crime prevention. In this way, the process becomes a blueprint and the award becomes the accomplishment of major components of a strategic plan related to quality of life.

Another possible incentive would be for insurance companies to extend premium reductions to policy holders in localities recognized as Safer By Design Communities. Premium reductions are already available on a limited basis on home owner policies for such things as deadbolt locks and security systems. The idea would be to link additional premium reductions to communities meeting Safer By Design standards.

The model for more extensive premium reductions already exists in underwriting fire risk. Fire insurance premiums are computed based on several variables linked to a community's fire services; such as fire department rating, and distances to the closest fire house and fire hydrant. The insurance industry has expressed interest in the past in attempting to quantify overall crime risk and trying to better link it to premiums. While premium reductions as sophisticated as this are not available now, implementation of a Safer By Design Program would provide a solid platform for a dialogue with the insurance industry and a possible pilot program.

VI. Findings and Recommendations

Finding 1: Establishing a Safer By Design Program holds a lot of promise for making the delivery of crime prevention services more comprehensive and professional at the local level. Designed through the joint efforts of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association and the Department of Criminal Justice Services, the proposed program would be very detailed. It would involve substantial efforts to administer it and substantial efforts for most localities to comply with the program's requirements. However, the proposed program would have the potential of providing a readily available blueprint for the delivery of state-of-the-art crime prevention services by more localities.

Recommendation 1: The Virginia State Crime Commission endorse the concept of establishing a Safer By Design Community Recognition Program.

Finding 2: It was estimated a Safer By Design Program would require an annual funding level of \$ 100,000. Four possible sources of funding were explored and evaluated: General Fund appropriation, federal grants, state income tax form check-off, and a surcharge on insurance premiums. There is a precedent for an insurance premium surcharge being used to fund a crime prevention program. Section 38.2-414 of the Code of Virginia is presently used to fund the *Help Eliminate Auto Theft* Fund (HEAT Fund). Whatever mechanism is used to fund the Safer By Design Program, it will be imperative to the program's success to fund it at an adequate level.

Recommendation 2: An adequate level of funding will be necessary to ensure localities are provided with the technical assistance and support services they will require to be successful in achieving recognition as a Safer By Design Community.

Finding 3: A Safer By Design Program would recognize localities for implementing comprehensive crime prevention services. Development, implementation and administration of the program would be an appropriate activity for the Department of Criminal Justice Services. Additionally, if SJR 263 leads to the establishment of the Virginia Crime Prevention Center within DCJS, the program would fit well with the proposed mission of the center.

Recommendation 3: If implemented, the Safer By Design Program should be administered by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, and by the Virginia Crime Prevention Center, if established.

Finding 4: As outlined in HJR 617, this study was completed with the assistance of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association. The VCPA provided invaluable assistance, including hosting the focus group responsible for designing the program's proposed requirements and operations. The VCPA should be included in any future activities related to the development of Safer By Design.

Recommendation 4: If implemented, the Safer By Design Program should be administered with the assistance of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association.

Finding 5: There are many developments currently taking place that intimately affect the proposed Safer By Design Program. Establishment of the Crime Prevention Specialist in the Code of Virginia during the 1993 Session of the General Assembly and the publishing of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association's Crime Prevention Standards are the two most important of these developments. Both the specialist and standards would have a major impact on the proposed program, and localities should be encouraged to pursue them until Safer By Design can be implemented.

Recommendation 5: Until a Safer By Design Program can be established, localities should be encouraged to implement the Virginia Crime Prevention Association's Crime Prevention Standards and have law enforcement personnel certified as Crime Prevention Specialists.

VII. Acknowledgments

Special thanks are extended to the following individuals and agencies for their cooperation and valuable assistance to this study effort:

Delegate Jean W. Cunningham of Richmond

Fred Russell, Executive Director
Virginia State Crime Commission

Carl Lee
Criminal Justice Services Board

Harold A. Wright, Executive Director
Virginia Crime Prevention Association

R. Allan Lassiter, Jr., Director
Division of Litter Control and Recycling
Department of Waste Management

Robert W. McClintock, Jr., Manager
Community Services
Department of Economic Development

Timothy S. Pfohl, Downtown Revitalization Planner
Division of Community Development
Department of Housing and Community Development

Members of the Virginia Crime Prevention Association
participating in the VCPA sponsored focus group

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA--1993 SESSION

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 617

Directing the Virginia State Crime Commission to oversee a study by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, Crime Prevention Unit, assisted by the Virginia Crime Prevention Association, concerning safer by design programs.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 9, 1993

Agreed to by the Senate, February 16, 1993

WHEREAS, the rate of violent crime is increasing in many communities across the Commonwealth, and the fear of victimization diminishes the quality of life in a community; and

WHEREAS, high crime rates and the perception that a community is unsafe can harm economic development efforts; and

WHEREAS, communities across the Commonwealth are taking steps to reduce crime and improve the safety of their citizens and guests, such as establishing safer by design community programs; and

WHEREAS, there appear to be practices and strategies that can be used to reduce both the incidence and fear of crime; and

WHEREAS, these strategies include but are not limited to (i) crime prevention planning committees, (ii) data collection and analysis, (iii) neighborhood watch programs, (iv) physical and environmental security assessment of neighborhoods, (v) the location of schools and business, and (vi) incorporation of environmental security in the community planning process; and

WHEREAS, communities should be recognized for their efforts in preventing crime; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Virginia State Crime Commission oversee a study by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, Crime Prevention Unit, assisted by the Virginia Crime Prevention Association, to determine a method of recognizing communities that utilize crime prevention strategies to improve the quality of community life. This study should determine (i) the standards for recognition, the criteria and procedure for certifying communities as a "Safer by Design Virginia Community," (ii) a mechanism for application and review, and (iii) methods to encourage communities to participate in the program.

The Virginia State Crime Commission shall complete its work in time to submit its recommendations to the Governor and the 1994 Session of the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents.

APPENDIX B

MANDATORY STANDARDS

FOR DESIGNATION AS A

CERTIFIED BUSINESS COMMUNITY

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Local Economic Development Organization

1. An active economic development organization responsible for industrial development of the community.
2. Local coordinator to serve as the prime contact for the local administration of the program.
3. Assignments to complete the program.
4. Adequate funds to carry out basic functions.

Community Information Requirements

5. Local marketing book to brief local contact team and to provide extensive data for the serious prospect.
6. Promotional brochure with emphasis on the community as a location for industry.
7. Community profile for distribution.
8. Audio-visual presentation with emphasis on the community as a location for industry.
9. Review of community brochure information on file with the Department of Economic Development.
10. Community maps.
11. Vocational education program.

Quality of Life Requirements

12. Conduct a community assessment.
13. Plan for dealing with deficiencies.
14. Community pride program.
15. Leisure services program.

Local Contact Team

16. Identification of prime contact person to organize local arrangements which include hosting responsibilities.
17. Formation of an active local team to meet with industrial prospects as required.
18. Well-rehearsed, well-planned community presentation and site tour for industrial prospects by knowledgeable local persons.
19. Local briefing room.

Finance Requirements

20. Existence of an active industrial development authority.
21. Active existence of at least one of the following:
 - A. Industrial Development Corporation.
 - B. Certified Development Corporation organized under SBA-504.
 - C. Local finance resources committee with financial institutions represented.
22. Person knowledgeable in local government finance matters.

Local Existing Industry Program

23. Formation of an active existing industry visitation team.
24. Visitation program which expresses the community's interest in each local industry and offers appropriate assistance.

25. Assistance program which provides a mechanism to facilitate existing industry access to:
- A. Local resources, technical training, finances, and mutual support programs.
 - B. Local and state governments.
 - C. Other Liaison roles.
26. Public awareness of existing industry and its local contributions.
27. Means to ensure that economic development organization and industry assistance programs are coordinated on a continuing basis.

Site and Building Requirements

28. Minimum requirements for site availability by community size:
- A. 1,500 to 15,000 population: Twenty total acres; minimum of two sites; maximum of three sites; minimum site size of five acres; property to be controlled by the local development organization.
 - B. Between 15,000 and 40,000 population: Fifty total acres; minimum of three sites; maximum of six sites; minimum site size of five acres; property to be controlled by the local economic development organization.
 - C. Over 40,000 population: One hundred total acres; minimum of four sites; maximum of ten sites; minimum site size of five acres; property to be controlled by the local economic development organization.
29. Complete site and building profiles.
30. Review and update site and building information on file in Department of Economic Development on a periodic basis.
31. Knowledge of area construction capabilities.

APPENDIX C

VIRGINIA MAIN STREET PROGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Eligibility Criteria:

1. Has a population between 1,200 and 50,00.
2. Guarantees that a local project manager will be employed for three years.
3. Guarantees that an adequate program operating budget will be funded for three years.
4. Has an existing downtown association or commits to organizing one.
5. Commits to working the 4-point Main Street Approach.
6. Enters into a letter of agreement with DHCD.

Selection Criteria:

1. Evidence that the local community and downtown organization understand the 4-point Main Street Approach.
2. Evidence that both the business community and the local government are willing to financially support the Main Street Program.
3. A compact well-defined Main Street project area.
4. Evidence of past revitalization efforts.
5. Historically or architecturally significant buildings in the downtown.
6. Capacity for effecting positive change.

Program Services:

1. Reconnaissance visits.
2. Organizational work sessions.
3. Main Street training session.
4. Resource team visits.
5. Design assistance.
6. Project manager meetings and workshops.
7. On-site assistance.
8. Public relations assistance.
9. Year-end evaluations.
10. Telephone consultations.

APPENDIX D

VIRGINIA CRIME PREVENTION ASSOCIATION

**FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS
JULY 14-16, 1993**

State Crime Commission

Fred Russell, Executive Director

Criminal Justice Services Board

Carl Lee

Virginia Crime Prevention Association

Lorraine Bartleson, Arlington County Police Department

Roger Barton, Prince William County Police Department

Patricia Boyd, Newport News Police Department

Carl Boyer, Norfolk Police Department

Dave Deringer, Chesterfield County Police Department

Tom Kincaid, Roanoke County Police Department

Steve Shifflette, University of Virginia Police Department

Jeff Steger, Steger and Associates

Harold Wright, Executive Director, VCPA

Department of Criminal Justice Services

Patrick Harris

George Gotschalk

Martin Mait

Jay Malcan

Donna Wells