

Discussion Points

1. Federal enactments and federal budget proposals often significantly impact State programs and fiscal resources. The Department of Law and Public Safety anticipates receiving and spending \$134.6 million in federal funds in FY 2007, a decrease of \$38 million or 28.5 percent.

- **Question:** What are the specific increases or decreases in federal funding anticipated in FY 2007? What specific new or revised federal mandates or matching requirements are expected? What impact will these changes have on the department's resources and activities in FY 2007? Please detail any local impact from these changes.

Answer: The department is working with our federal delegation to identify funding sources for priority programs. The following represents this department's estimated funding levels and the preliminary changes for federal 2007 based on President Bush's proposed budget:

Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant - This program is targeted for elimination (FY05 \$634 million nationally, FY06 - \$416 million nationally; NJ's FY05 award - \$8,350,330, NJ's FY06 award \$5,160,709). Approximately 60 percent of the Byrne grant funds are awarded to local governments.

Elimination of this grant would mean the loss of 250 critical positions in all areas of the criminal justice system including: state and county prosecutors, investigators, municipal police officers, substance abuse treatment professionals, and community workers. Loss of the grant would be felt within law enforcement, the courts, corrections, and prevention and treatment programs, all of which utilize these federal funds.

The County Multi-Jurisdictional Narcotics Task Forces would be greatly impacted by loss of the grant. In the past several years, the task forces have made more than 21,000 drug arrests, recovered more than 900 weapons, and seized more than \$17 million in criminal assets. The task forces have also removed significant quantities of drugs from the streets including more than 204,000 grams of cocaine, 400 grams of methamphetamine and 27,000 dosage units of heroin.

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) - This program is also targeted for elimination (FY05 - \$25 million nationally, FY06 - \$10 million nationally; NJ's FY05 award - \$662,026, NJ's FY06 award \$190,841). Without the RSAT program, several adult and juvenile substance abuse treatment programs will be curtailed. Two Juvenile Justice Commission programs will also be eliminated.

Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences - This program is also proposed for elimination. (FY05 - \$15 million, FY06 - \$18.5 million; NJ's FY05 award - \$282,136 Formula, NJ's FY06 award \$297,337)

Loss of this funding will diminish our ability to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of criminal-justice-related forensic science services. In FY 2005, the funds were spent on overtime, equipment, training and books.

Juvenile Justice Title V Delinquency Prevention - This program is being reduced by \$33 million nationally (FY05 - \$80 million nationally, FY06 - \$65 million nationally, FY07 \$32 million nationally; NJ's FY05 award - \$403,000, NJ's FY06 award \$84,375).

A loss of Title V funding could result in the elimination of prevention programs for high-risk youth, as well as the loss of generalized prevention programs for all young people. Elimination of these programs will impact negatively on the state's juvenile population, as well as the communities in which they live.

Juvenile Accountability Block Grant - This program is designated for elimination (FY05 - \$55 million nationally, FY06 - \$50 million nationally; NJ's FY05 award - \$1,149,400, NJ's FY06 award \$1,059,100). Seventy-five percent goes to the local level and 25 percent is the state share.

Loss of this funding would result in elimination of approximately 125 programs serving young people throughout the entire juvenile justice system.

Violence Against Women STOP Grant - This program is being reduced by \$14 million nationally (FY05 - \$187 million nationally, FY06 - \$187 million nationally, FY07 - \$173 million; NJ's FY05 award - \$3,091,000, NJ's FY06 award \$3,235,426).

A reduction in funding could result in a loss of local programs that focus on female victims of violence. Many of these initiatives focus on serving underserved populations, and they incorporate such concerns as cultural diversity and issues confronting the elderly. With reduced funding, it is likely that certain important focus areas will not be given the attention they deserve.

Although some of the programs -- the National Criminal History Improvement Program, DNA Initiative, Project Safe Neighborhoods and the Juvenile Justice State Formula Grant -- are the subject of proposed increases in funding, these increases will not compensate for proposed decreases and eliminations. Many programs that are currently targeted for elimination have enabled our department to strengthen its ability to fight crime and provide vital protective services.

In addition to the proposed justice assistance appropriations, the Department of Homeland Security's funding will also be adjusted compared to last year. The proposed changes are as follows:

- Urban Area Security Initiative grants are being increased by \$73 million nationally.
- Targeted Infrastructure Protection grant program will be introduced for the first year, at a funding level of \$600 million nationally.
- State Homeland Security Grants are being reduced by \$312 million nationally.
- Emergency Management Performance Grants are increasing by \$15 million nationally.
- Citizen Corps program is being increased by \$15 million nationally.

The requested increase in Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grants will increase funding for those metropolitan areas most at risk because of their population size and density, as well as the key facilities and infrastructure located within them. The request for \$600 million in Targeted Infrastructure Protection grants incorporates a variety of programs aimed at protecting key transportation facilities, as well as other critical infrastructure.

On March 2, 2006, the Department submitted its FY06 Homeland Security Grant Program application and comprehensive "target capability and needs assessments" to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). New Jersey's actual FY06 award will not be announced until May 31, 2006. The award will be based on a peer review of the submitted target capability and needs assessment, combined with application, by DHS, of a risk formula based on geographic location and assets.

Justice assistance funding is a vital component of homeland security, and the threat of terrorism has not reduced other types of crime that require the justice community's continuing attention. Reduction or elimination of these grants will decimate many important crime prevention and homeland security efforts.

2. The FY 2007 recommended budget reflects a decrease in the Division of Law salaries and wages of \$3.35 million from the FY 2006 \$18 million appropriation. This cut in salaries and wages is reflective of a decrease of 40 Division of Law positions. Division of Law evaluation data reflects increases in anticipated caseloads; however, the projected reimbursements remain flat at \$57.8 million (page D-297).

- **Question:** Please provide an assessment of how the division will continue to provide comparable legal services as a result of the position cuts, including notation of what, if any, State agencies will not have comparable access to legal assistance. Does the division expect to be outsourcing legal services?

Answer: The Division of Law does not anticipate using outside counsel as a result of recent reductions in the number of Deputy Attorneys General, nor does it expect to reduce the level of services provided to client agencies. The Division is currently examining its processes and structure in order to become as effective, and efficient, as possible in allocating its legal resources. Caseload data will be closely monitored to allow for a quick response to shifting needs. Also, the manner in which the Division uses its attorney assistant and paralegal support will be analyzed and modified as needed.

3. Over the past few years, the Office of the Attorney General has made combating gang activity one of its key priorities. The Governor's FY2007 budget recommends new funding of \$2 million for anti-gang programs. An estimated \$1 million will fund Project Phoenix (\$250,000) and Operation Cease Fire (\$750,000).

Additionally, a new "gang violence/organized crime unit" is being created within the Division of Criminal Justice. No funding is recommended explicitly for this unit, and funding for division salaries is recommended to decrease in FY 2007.

- **Question:** What will the staffing complement be for the new unit? What reallocation, if any, in State Police staff is required to support the division's unit and ensure its effectiveness? Is the department emulating the experiences of other State-level law enforcement agencies in this re-organizational initiative? What consideration has been given to reproducing the Camden Initiative in other municipalities where gang activity is centered?

Answer: Staffing for the Gang and Organized Crime Section will include 20 attorneys and approximately 30 investigators reallocated from within the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ). With these resources, and an organizational structure that emphasizes flexibility, the department is well positioned to effectively combat gang violence and organized crime. The new structure within DCJ is consistent with the approach State Police has taken to restructure its own anti-gang initiative.

State Police recently has reorganized many of its functions relating to gang and organized crime investigations. Specifically, three regional organized crime bureaus have been created with a principal mission of collecting intelligence on street gangs, organized crime, and drug trafficking. In addition, 19 State Police

detectives have been reassigned from narcotics to gangs. The changes at DCJ will compliment this structure. An understanding of the importance of intelligence-led policing is evident in the new structures of DCJ and the State Police, and will serve as a cornerstone of our gang initiatives. Both the State Police and DCJ are reviewing methods -- utilizing existing funding -- to put more resources into intelligence gathering and analysis.

The Camden Initiative, combined with the experience of the Newark/Irvington Cease Fire Program, will be the model used by DCJ in combating gang activity in 10 sites: Newark/Irvington, Trenton, Camden, Patterson, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Vineland, New Brunswick, Atlantic City and Lakewood. These programs have several common elements, including: (a) intelligence-driven policing decisions, made after a full review of the crime (b) enforcement in target zones against the highest-risk offenders, allowing for the greatest impact in areas having the greatest law enforcement needs; (c) partnerships of local, state and federal authorities to maximize the impact of enforcement activity; and (d) involvement of community groups and leaders.

• **Question:** Gang activity and violence is a problem that transcends local and state boundaries. What assistance, if any, is the State receiving from the Federal level? What impact on local law enforcement agencies will result from the department's heightened emphasis on attacking gang and organized crime activities?

Answer: As experience has taught, gang activity crosses local, state and even national borders. The Gang and Organized Crime Section within DCJ will work cooperatively with local and federal authorities to combat gang activity and gang-related violence. Federal authorities (working with DCJ staff) have made funding for anti-gang partnerships in Newark, Irvington, Trenton, Camden and southern New Jersey their top federal funding request. We should know shortly what level of funding will be approved for this effort. DCJ also is seeking more active partnerships with federal authorities to see that gang cases are prosecuted in the most appropriate, efficient and effective manner.

As for local involvement, local law enforcement agencies in the 10 cease fire sites, will be asked to contribute staff and law enforcement intelligence to these enforcement efforts. The Operation Cease Fire project will begin with an intelligence-based assessment of each city's largest crime problem, and where it is most prevalent. State and local investigators and prosecutors will then target their efforts accordingly.

4. Chapter 311, Laws of 2005 increased motor vehicle registration surcharges by \$3. Of the total additional revenue (\$21 million), two-thirds is dedicated for the operational, maintenance and capital costs associated with the New Jersey Emergency Medical Service Helicopter Response Program. The remaining third is dedicated for new State Police trooper classes.

The entire \$21 million in new surcharge revenue is anticipated in the FY 2007 budget. The budget, however, increases funding for Medevac and law enforcement helicopters by only \$1.5 million. Furthermore, while funding for State Police recruit classes increases by \$200,000, from \$2.5 million to \$2.7 million, the budget purports to achieve a savings of \$3.8 million by delaying State Police recruit classes.

The New Jersey Emergency Medical Services Helicopter Response Program, established by the Legislature pursuant to P.L. 1986, c.106, provides for emergency transport and care for trauma patients in New Jersey. The unit's fleet of helicopters is on average 16 years old and the operating and maintenance costs are increasing.

- **Question:** How does the department expect to maintain the effectiveness of the New Jersey Emergency Medical Service Helicopter Response Program? Please describe plans for helicopter replacement. What is the projected remaining useful life of each Medevac helicopter? How many days in FY 2005 and thus far in FY 2006 was each aircraft in the fleet grounded for maintenance and/or repair reasons? What is the estimated annual cost of fleet maintenance for FY 2005 and FY 2006? Please provide information on the number of Medevac flights which have been conducted in the current and past two fiscal years. What is the average cost per Medevac flight for FY 2005 and thus far in FY 2006?

Answer: The department does have a Medevac helicopter replacement plan in place to maintain the effectiveness of the helicopter response program. An additional Medevac helicopter was purchased in November 2005. Future planned purchases are as follows: FY 2007 - two helicopters, FY 2008 - one helicopter and FY 2009 - two helicopters. The purchase process, which will include a request for information (RFI), is expected to take approximately seven months, and a bid may be awarded by this fall. The estimated delivery time for such complex helicopters ranges from 18-to-24 months for the first helicopter. In assessing the useful life of a helicopter, the industry standard is generally 10 years. However, increased maintenance and parts replacement can keep an aircraft flight-worthy. Engines can be replaced and airframes can be repaired. The current ages of the Medevac helicopters range from 12-to-18-years-old.

The Aviation Bureau records maintenance and repairs by calendar year. Below are the number of days for 2005 and 2006, to date, that each aircraft has been grounded for maintenance or repairs:

Calendar year 2005:

N1NJ 140 days

N5NJ 72 days

N9NJ 115 days

N7NJ unknown at this time. maintenance records travel with the aircraft, which is currently in for upfitting in Pennsylvania.

Calendar year 2006 to date:

N1NJ 12 days

N5NJ 30 days

N9NJ 2 days

N7NJ 64 days

N8NJ (Purchased in November 2005)

In FY 2005, \$1.8 million was spent on Medevac helicopter maintenance from the operating account, and \$1.1 million has been spent to date in FY 2006.

The number of Medevac flights incorporates responses to emergencies, inter-hospital transportation and cancelled flights, and is tracked by calendar year as indicated below:

2005 - 1,883

2004 - 1,758

2003 - 1,616

The average response flight is approximately one hour from start to finish. Estimated cost for the aircraft and pilot is \$2,700 per hour.

Question: As the budget only recommends \$2.7 million in funding for one State Police Trooper class, does the Division of State Police estimate it will be able to meet its recruiting and hiring goals? Please provide a statistical breakdown by gender, race and ethnicity of the FY 2004, FY 2005 and FY 2006 trooper recruit classes. Please provide a statistical breakdown of the State Police positions including Colonel, Major, Captain, Lieutenant, Sergeant, Trooper II and Trooper I. In the breakdown, please include gender, race and ethnicity and recent promotions.

Answer: The Division of State Police will be able to meet its recruiting and hiring goals with the proposed FY2007 recruit class. It is anticipated that, with the

graduation of this class, there will be more than 3,000 troopers in the State Police. The statistical breakdown is attached.

5a. The Governor's 2007 budget recommends a new State Aid appropriation of \$20 million -- entitled Capital for Homeland Security Critical Infrastructure -- in the newly established Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness (page D-295). This appropriation is intended to fund interoperable communications, tools for intelligence sharing, and enhanced protection for vital infrastructure. The budget also recommends a continued State Aid appropriation of \$32 million for Municipal Homeland Security Assistance (page D-60) within the Department of Community Affairs.

- **Question:** These two State aid programs appear similar in purpose. Please describe how they differ and how they will be coordinated in the future.

Answer: The Department of Community Affairs' budget recommendation for Municipal Homeland Security Assistance is based on a formula maintained by that department.

The \$20 million recommended for the Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness is for "one-time" homeland security needs, such as interoperable communications equipment, tools for intelligence sharing, enhanced protection of vital infrastructure and port/rail yard security. It is anticipated that the funding will be used to address these state-wide priorities. Criteria for allocation of this funding will be established after we are informed of New Jersey's final federal Homeland Security award. Based on this federal funding allocation, of which 80% will be devoted to local government, we will assess how critical statewide needs can best be met by the additional \$20 million allocation.

- **Question:** Please explain how the Department of Law and Public Safety is currently assessing homeland security equipment, infrastructure and training needs of the local governments Statewide. Does the department have sufficient knowledge of local capabilities and needs to effectively target this new funding to critical needs on a timely basis? By what process, on what timetable and by what criteria or eligibility standards will this new funding be allocated?

Answer: The Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness is committed to a distribution of funds based solely on the risk, threat and vulnerability. This office is in the midst of conducting a statewide vulnerability assessment. It will include an evaluation of homeland security equipment, infrastructure and training needs. The review and analysis will be done on May 16, 2006. Subsequent to the review and analysis, it will be shared with local homeland security officials.

Again, the final decisions and recommendations will be forthcoming.

- **Question:** Please detail any prior years' expenditures, and provide an assessment of the progress being made, to establish a Statewide interoperable communications system. What does the department estimate as the total cost of such a system and what is the projected annual cost of maintaining it once it is fully operational?

Answer: The New Jersey Interoperability Communications System (NJICS) is a statewide communication system comprised of a series of specific, interoperable communications assets established in each of New Jersey's five regions. These assets include radio cache radios; interconnect switches, tactical interoperability channels and region-wide interoperability channels. The infrastructure for the NJICS is housed at local and county sites in the five individual regions. Using the NJICS, public safety agencies at every level can achieve interoperability via the radios they own today.

In order to provide a progress report on the NJICS, a discussion of the starting point for interoperable communications must be stated. Prior to implementing the NJICS, there were not many interoperability channels available to the average first responder, and they varied by county.

Interoperability was limited to a small number of channels, all in one frequency band (VHF). Most communications on this system were also specified for law enforcement use only, so other first responders -- for example, firefighters and emergency medical services personnel -- had no other means for interoperability.

Following the initial build-out of the NJICS, a variety of resources are now available in the different regions based on funding that was available. The Northeast/UASI region is the most developed system at this point, and serves as the model for the other regions. Currently, the following interoperability assets are available to the average New Jersey first responder via NJICS:

- Regional Central Dispatch (24/7/365).
- Region-wide tactical interoperability channels in each radio band.
- Over 2,000 radio cache radios distributed throughout the state's regions.
- Radio caches includes 21 interconnect switches for tactical operations only (another 18 are on order).

- NJ Interconnect switches, which are the first in the nation to have voice IDs, transmit their ID every ½ hour.
- Includes portable communications equipment that can be moved to an incident in the event the infrastructure is unavailable
- Interoperability channels, not agency operating channels, are connected for interoperability remotely
- System also provides a direct connection to NYC agencies (NYPD, NY OEM, NYFD)
- Direct interoperability with NJ Transit (Transit also has 20 radio cache radios)
- A Project 25 solution (Federal interoperability standard)

Following are the Office of the Attorney General's expenditures to date on New Jersey Interoperable Communications System. Expenditures are broken down by region (the North West and Shore regions were provided funding directly by County UASI federal funds, but are also part of the NJICS):

NJICS: Northeast/UASI Region
(Morris, Essex, Hudson, Bergen, Union, and Passaic counties)

Description	Federal Funding	State Funding	Grant Year
Interoperability Equipment, installations, etc.	\$1,225,000	\$0	UASI 03
Consulting Services	\$25,000	\$0	UASI 03
Miscellaneous		\$0	UASI 04
Interoperability Equipment, installations, etc.	\$1,470,750	\$0	UASI 04
Frequency Coordination	\$37,363	\$0	UASI 04
Miscellaneous	\$2,925	\$0	UASI 04
Interoperability Equipment, installations, etc.	\$633,966	\$0	UASI 05
Frequency Coordination	\$360		UASI 05
Consulting Services	\$149,850	\$0	UASI 05
Miscellaneous	\$1,391		UASI 05
TOTAL	\$3,546,605	\$0	UASI 03 – 05

Central Region

(Monmouth, Middlesex, Somerset, and Mercer counties)

Description	Federal Funding	State Funding	Fiscal Year
Interoperability Equipment, installations, etc.	\$967,317	\$0	HSGP 04
Consulting Services	\$0	\$0	HSGP 04
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	HSGP 04
TOTAL	\$967,317	\$0	

Delaware River Region

(Burlington, Salem, Camden, Cumberland, and Gloucester counties)

Description	Federal Funding	State Funding	Fiscal Year
Interoperability Equipment, installations, etc.	\$999,989	\$0	HSGP 03
Interoperability Equipment, installations, etc.	\$1,000,000	\$0	HSGP 04
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	HSGP 03 -04
TOTAL	\$1,999,989	\$0	

We are still working on an estimated cost for a new, complete system. We need to continue build on the success that local, county and state agencies have experienced using the New Jersey Interoperability Communications System. A new system would allow the existing radio infrastructures to be expanded to support the building of a regional or statewide system. This investment would provide for a system of systems approach where New Jersey leverages the frequency and communications assets that are already used by New Jersey public safety agencies throughout the state. A system needs to be developed that has statewide coverage and the capacity to handle the large number of first responder agencies that exist in New Jersey.

Maintenance of such a system would consist of routine infrastructure upgrades and replacement of parts. Industry standard is normally 15% of the initial investment. It is important to note that, if we could quantify the amount of money spent on the various radio systems that exist in the state today, it would greatly exceed this amount.

To date the NJICS has provided the short term solution to interoperability. Further investment will provide the long term solution for the interoperability issue. NJICS has successfully provided interoperability at a number of events which are described in an attachment to this document.

In order to, give the reader an idea of the costs, below are examples of the investments made by other states in order to provide a similar type of statewide system.

New York State	\$2,050,000,000 (initial investment)
Pennsylvania State	\$1,250,000,000 (initial investment)
Virginia State	\$ 329,000,000 (initial investment)

5b. Recommended budget language would allow transfer, without prior legislative approval, of Capital for Homeland Security Critical Infrastructure funds to other departments and State agencies for homeland security purposes (page D-296)

- *Question:* Is this language intended to assist in choosing the most appropriate State agency to serve as a conduit for allocating these funds to local recipients? Is this language intended to permit redirection of these funds from the local level to meet State agency and State security infrastructure needs?

Answer: No, the language is not intended to choose another State agency as a conduit for these funds. The language allows for a State agency to use these funds based on security priorities.

6. Pursuant to R.S. 53:2-1, the State Police "shall primarily be employed in furnishing adequate police protection to the inhabitants of rural sections." The Department of Law and Public Safety currently provides 78 municipalities full-time rural policing services and provides part-time services to 13 municipalities. These services are estimated to cost \$80 million annually. The FY 2007 budget recommends a system for charging municipalities who use State Police services. The budget estimates that the department will collect \$24 million from this system.

- *Question:* Based on the recommended budget language (page 281) please identify which municipalities are required to pay for rural police services. Please provide the amounts that each municipality will pay for full time

service, the number of households that will serve as a basis for establishing full-time service charges and the source of this household count. Will the service charge be revised for a municipality if crime increases or decreases, and will the patrols be increased or decreased based on those changes? What portion of the total estimated revenue from rural patrol services reflects full-time service, part-time and new State Police patrols, respectively?

Answer: Please see the attached chart. It includes the identified municipalities, the amounts that each municipality will pay, and the total housing units within the respective municipalities. The housing unit data was found at www.census.gov. The formula is not based on crime rates, therefore the payment will not change. Full-time rural patrol services will generate \$20,608,000 million, and part time rural patrol services will generate \$3,558,400 million. No estimated revenue from new State Police patrols was included in the total revenue figure.

- **Question:** Pursuant to recommended budget language, if the Superintendent determines that a municipality shall receive patrol services in the absence of a cost sharing agreement, how will the cost of service be determined?

Answer: Regarding the language that permits the Superintendent, in consultation with the Attorney General, to provide rural patrol services when necessitated, payment will be decided on a case-by-case basis. The budget language allows the Department of Law and Public Safety and State Police to absorb the costs of the police protection or withhold State Aid payments.

- **Question:** Please clarify the intent of the recommended budget language (page D-281) allowing the State Treasurer to "... use monies from any grant in aid or State aid appropriated ... to meet the local share ..." of rural policing services. Is it intended that categorical State grants received by a municipality for a certain program or service, for example, parks, could be diverted to fund State Police patrols? If this is the intention, please explain how this is justified.

Answer: The budget language is intended to give municipalities the flexibility to use state appropriations, as well as municipal resources, to reimburse the state for rural patrol services. The language also clarifies that the cost-sharing agreement does not authorize the municipality to use Constitutionally dedicated monies, bond monies, or federal monies to cover the cost of rural patrol, if the use of such monies for such purposes is inconsistent with the Constitution or federal law.

- **Question:** Recommended budget language on page D-281 provides for an adjustment to a municipality's budget cap when it elects to pay for State Patrol services. Please clarify, using a hypothetical calculation, how a municipality's budget cap will be affected by electing to pay for rural patrol services.

Answer: The budget language gives municipalities the ability to increase their spending under the budget cap to cover the expense. It is anticipated that a municipality would enact, as part of their CY07 budget, an amount equal to any charges owed to the State Treasurer for Rural Services. Once the budget is adopted at the local level, payment would be made to the State.

7. The FY 2007 budget assumes a savings of \$55 million by enhancing oversight of Medicaid and General Assistance to detect and reduce fraud (page B-8). The FY 2005, FY 2006 & FY 2007 budgets show that nearly \$10 million has been provided through federal funding to fund a Medicaid Fraud Unit.

- **Question:** Please provide an assessment of Medicaid fraud in New Jersey. Please include how many cases the State has investigated, prosecuted, and settled. What is the average time between the opening and closing of a case? Please provide the amount of funding recovered to date. What role will the department play in achieving the projected savings from fraud detection? What additional resources will it target to fulfill that effort?

Answer: Since 1978, the state agency charged with investigating and prosecuting fraud in the administration of the Medicaid Program, as well as in the provision of Medicaid-covered services, is the Medicaid Fraud Section (also referred to as the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit) within the Office of Insurance Fraud Prosecutor, Division of Criminal Justice. The Medicaid Fraud Section has also assumed responsibility for policing the Pharmaceutical Assistance to the Aged and Disabled, and Senior Gold pharmaceutical assistance programs. In addition, the Medicaid Fraud Section has direct responsibility to investigate allegations of patient abuse and neglect in all facilities that receive Medicaid funds, or that house residents or patients who receive Medicaid benefits.

To avoid institutional conflicts of interest, the Medicaid Fraud Section has historically been separate and distinct from the State Medicaid Program, which is administered by the Department of Human Services, Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services (DMAHS). Although New Jersey receives 50 percent of its Medicaid Program expenditures from the federal government, the Medicaid Fraud Section receives 75 percent of its operational funding from the

federal government, with the remaining 25 percent provided through a State match.

By policing the program and ferreting out fraud, the Medicaid Fraud Section continues to serve a vital role in the administration of Medicaid, which has grown to be one of the largest single expenditures in the State budget. Given the current magnitude of the program, valuable state and federal taxpayer dollars continue to be at risk. The following chart shows the number of cases the Medicaid Fraud Section has investigated, prosecuted and disposed of in the years 2004 and 2005, as well as in 2006 to date:

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>
Fraud Referrals	19	19	TBD
Cases Opened	103	119	40
Cases Closed	82	100	26
Pending - End of Year	142	161	175
Defendants Charged	4	26	5
Convictions	7	17	3
Sentencings	21	26	3

It is difficult to calculate the average life of a case. The length of time between the opening and closing of a case depends on many factors including: the complexity of the case, investigative steps taken, the degree of cooperation of witnesses and subjects of the investigation, the amount and source of records collected and analyzed, and the resources available to direct to any particular matter. Often, Medicaid cases also involve collateral or parallel proceedings, such as Medicaid debarment, licensing issues for practitioners, and civil forfeiture.

Cases are put into the judicial system through either indictment or accusation (case settlement). Once a matter is in the judicial system, the State is subject to the court's calendar, defense attorneys' calendars and witness availability. The timely movement of cases is a significant priority of the Medicaid Fraud Section, as is using innovative means to detect fraud.

An example of a timely and successful prosecution is State v. Amwell Dental. The matter was opened on August 19, 2004 and, on September 23, 2004, the Medicaid Fraud Section executed a search warrant. The defendant, a licensed dentist, entered a guilty plea on May 27, 2005 and was sentenced to State Prison on July 25, 2005 -- less than one year after the case was opened. Another example of a speedy resolution is State v. Springfield Pharmacy. This matter was opened on May 8, 2003 and, on May 28, 2003, the Medicaid Fraud Section executed a search warrant. The defendant, a registered pharmacist, pleaded guilty on December 19,

2003. On March 12, 2004, the defendant was sentenced to State Prison, again less than one year after the case was opened.

In other cases, resolution has been more protracted. For example, the matter of State v. Ojah Pharmacy was opened on May 14, 2003. Numerous undercover operations were scheduled and undertaken. The investigation was delayed due to difficulty in dealing with cooperating witnesses, and a need to build necessary proofs in the case. Since prescriptions are generally renewed by a pharmacy every 30 days, a schedule was set to renew each pretext prescription several times. A search warrant was executed on October 28, 2004. After protracted settlement negotiations that proved futile, the defendants were indicted on July 14, 2005. On March 21, 2006, after a 5 week jury trial, two employees of the pharmacy and the pharmacy itself were convicted, almost three years after the case was initially opened. Both individual employees face State Prison commitments when sentenced.

The following chart shows the approximate age of current, open investigations and cases in the Medicaid Fraud Section:

	<u>0-1yr</u>	<u>1-2yrs</u>	<u>2-3yrs</u>	<u>3-4yrs</u>	<u>4-5yrs</u>	<u>5yr</u> (fugitive cases)
# of cases	82	46	16	13	12	6

In addition to seeking restitution and criminal fines, the Medicaid Fraud Section is aggressive in utilizing the Medicaid civil false claims statute, N.J.S.A. 30:4D-17e, to punish offenders and return dollars to the State treasury. This makes the Medicaid Fraud Section a cost-effective mechanism to ensure that New Jersey's vital state interests are protected. For the past three federal fiscal years, for each State dollar spent, the Medicaid Fraud Section has recovered: \$6.51 in 2005, \$17.20 in 2004, and \$7.14 in 2003. The following chart demonstrates this point:

	State Dollars Spent	State Dollars Received*	State Dollars Recovered for Each State Dollar Spent
FY 2005	\$816,221.00	\$5,318,042.00	\$6.51
FY 2004	\$686,510.00	\$11,808,275.00	\$17.20
FY 2003	\$629,457.00	\$4,493,860.00	\$7.14

*State dollars received refers to one-half the restitution and all civil false claims penalties since, under New Jersey law, restitution that is collected in a Medicaid case is shared equally between the federal government and the State (because the Medicaid program is funded in that manner. Penalty money collected through the Medicaid Fraud Section's efforts, however, is allocated entirely to the State.

The Medicaid Fraud Section is responsible for investigating and prosecuting violations of all applicable State laws pertaining to fraud in the administration of Medicaid, the provision of medical assistance, or the activities of providers of medical assistance under the State Medicaid Plan.

Preventing and detecting Medicaid provider fraud, waste and abuse is the responsibility of the Medicaid Program, which is administered by the Department of Human Services, Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services (DMAHS). DMAHS is required to refer all cases of suspected fraud to the Medicaid Fraud Section. Fraud deterrence begins with high quality referrals from DMAHS that can be successfully prosecuted by the Medicaid Fraud Section. The Medicaid Fraud Section will continue to fulfill its mission and accept all referrals from DMAHS.

The Department of Health and Senior Services is responsible for referring suspected cases of fraud related to the reporting of nursing home costs. The Medicaid Fraud Section will continue to accept referrals from, and work closely with, the Department of Health and Senior Services in their fraud prevention and detection efforts.

The Medicaid Fraud Section will also continue its close liaison with the National Association of Medicaid Fraud Control Units in Washington, D.C. This collaboration has proven to be extremely productive, and has enabled the Medicaid Fraud Section to participate in all national cases where the New Jersey Medicaid Program has been victimized. In addition, the Medicaid Fraud Section will continue to develop its own cases through the use of cooperating witnesses, confidential informants and the OIFP hotline. The Medicaid Fraud Section will continue its practice of negotiating the best possible settlement for the Medicaid Program to recover restitution as well as civil and false claims penalties under the State Medicaid false claims statute.

The Medicaid Fraud Section has 43 authorized positions: one Assistant Attorney General, 10 Deputy Attorneys General, 22 State Investigators, 7 Professionals and 3 Clericals. Five of these positions -- namely two Deputy Attorneys General, two State Investigators and one professional -- are dedicated to the Elder Abuse and Neglect Unit within the section. To have the greatest impact, the Medicaid

Fraud Section should be fully staffed so as to best meet its mission of protecting the Medicaid Program and its beneficiaries from fraud, waste and abuse. There are currently four Investigator vacancies and one professional vacancy. The federal government funds 75 percent of the Medicaid Fraud Section's costs. We are currently reviewing staffing needs for this unit. There is a productive referral relationship that has been established between the Medicaid Fraud section and the Department of Health and Senior Services and the outside auditing firm.

MINORITY BREAKDOWN OF FY 2004 - FY 2006 ACADEMY GRADUATES

CLASS#	WM	WF	BM	BF	HM	HF	AM	AF	AIM	total
133	20	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	24
134	17	2	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	26
135	40	2	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	50
136	39	0	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	45
137	38	2	3	0	6	0	1	0	0	50
138	35	1	2	0	11	0	1	0	0	50
139	59	2	8	2	11	0	2	0	0	84
140	33	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	38
141	33	2	3	0	2	0	4	0	1	45
142	57	3	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	70
143	50	2	1	0	7	0	0	1	0	61
TOTALS	421	19	28	4	59	0	10	1	1	543
%	77.53%	3.50%	5.16%	0.74%	10.87%	0.00%	1.84%	0.18%	0.18%	100%

**NEW JERSEY STATE POLICE
ENLISTED MEMBERS BREAKDOWN
BY RANK, RACE & GENDER**

	WHITE			BLACK			HISPANIC			ASIAN			AM. INDIAN		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	TOTAL	
Col.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LTC	4	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Maj.	11	2	13	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Capt.	42	3	45	3	0	3	4	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	53
%	1.4%	0.1%	1.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Lt.	175	7	182	16	0	16	5	0	5	2	0	2	3	3	208
%	5.9%	0.2%	6.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	7.0%
SFC	144	7	151	14	0	14	10	0	10	3	0	3	1	1	179
%	4.8%	0.2%	5.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%
DSFC	87	3	90	10	0	10	8	0	8	3	0	3	0	0	111
%	2.9%	0.1%	3.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%
SSgt.	114	0	114	9	0	9	11	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	135
%	3.8%	0.0%	3.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%
Sgt.	285	7	292	44	1	45	20	0	20	3	0	3	5	5	365
%	9.6%	0.2%	9.8%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	12.2%
DSG	141	7	148	13	1	14	10	0	10	2	0	2	0	0	174
%	4.7%	0.2%	5.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%

	WHITE			BLACK			HISPANIC			ASIAN			AM. INDIAN		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	FEMAL	TOTAL	MALE	TOTAL	
Tpr. I	313	6	319	35	1	36	14	0	14	2	0	2	2	2	373
%	10.5%	0.2%	10.7%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	12.5%
Det. I	100	4	104	5	0	5	10	0	10	1	0	1	1	1	121
%	3.4%	0.1%	3.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%
Tpr. II	161	6	167	9	0	9	7	0	7	1	0	1	3	3	187
%	5.4%	0.2%	5.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	6.3%
Det. II	46	4	50	3	0	3	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	59
%	1.5%	0.1%	1.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Tpr.	753	39	792	49	6	55	102	1	103	16	1	17	4	4	971
%	25.3%	1.3%	26.6%	1.6%	0.2%	1.8%	3.4%	0.0%	3.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	32.6%
Det.	17	2	19	0	1	1	3	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	25
%	0.6%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
TOTAL	2393	97	2490	210	11	221	212	2	214	34	1	35	21	21	2981
%	80.3%	3.2%	83.5%	7.1%	0.4%	7.4%	7.1%	0.1%	7.2%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.7%	0.7%	100%

INTEROPERABILITY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- **Essex County Jail Move** – Involved the move of the Essex County Jail facility from West Caldwell to Newark. Incident involved the Essex County Sheriff's Department, New Jersey State Police, NJ Department of Corrections, and Essex County Corrections.
- **Republican National Convention (RNC)**– Involved support bi-state (New Jersey and New York) communications during the RNC in the 800 MHZ frequency band. The NJICS provided primary 800 MHZ interoperability in the New York City area. Involved agencies included Secret Service, Federal Bureau of Investigations, New Jersey State Police, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, Essex County Sheriff's Department, New York City OEM, and the New York Police Department.
- **Orange Alert** – After the Department of Homeland Security raised the alert level to Orange around the Prudential building in Newark, the NJICS provided direct connectivity for the New Jersey State Police (800MHz) and the Newark Police Department (UHF) within 10 minutes of receiving the request.
- **TOPOFF: Project Exodus** – During the national TOPOFF exercise held in New Jersey and Connecticut, the NJICS provided wide area command and control interoperability for over 150 EMS agencies in an area that spanned from the Meadowlands in Bergen County to the PNC Arts Center in Monmouth County. All EMS agencies then converged on Newark Liberty Airport and conducted their tactical operations on the NJICS tactical channels.
- **TOPOFF Nutley and Wanaque Points Of Distribution** – At these PODs the NJICS provided over 50 radio cache radios to effectuate interoperability.
- **PGA Championship** – At the PGA Championship held in Springfield New Jersey, the NJICS provided primary communications for the New Jersey State Police, Union County Prosecutor's Office, and Union County OEM. The entire events radio requirements were met using the NJICS channels.
- **Hudson County Rapid Deployment Team (RDT)**– After the London bombing, the Hudson County RDT which is comprised of over 12 local law enforcement agencies was deployed on the passenger Ferry's operating in this area for approximately a 2 month period. As each agency had different radios, the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office requested radios from the NJICS radio cache. The operation ran successfully from the Jersey City, Hoboken, Weehawken and Ocean County ports into the New York City ports. The furthest operation in New York City reached into the Brooklyn Port. This deployment occurred at the same time as the PGA championship, so the NJICS managed two large scale incidents at the same time.

US Coast Guard Joint Boarding Tactical Exercise – During this exercise the NJICS provided primary interoperable communications in Port Newark for US Coast Guard, Newark Fire Department, Newark Police Emergency Services Unit, New Jersey State Police, Union County Police Department, Newark OEM, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, University Hospital – EMS, and Jersey City EMS. The exercise tested critical command and control functions in a tactical boarding exercise of a commercial ship.

When utilized the NJICS has provided an interoperability capability that never existed before in this state.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o	p
Municipalities	County	FT/PT	Average Residential Property Value	EQ Residential Property Value	Respective County Average EQ Property Value	Respective County Average Net (for rebates) Property Taxes	Respective County Average Ratio of Taxes to EQ Value	Average Residential Property Taxes	Average Property Tax Rebate	Average Net (of rebates) Residential Property Taxes	Ratio of Net Property Value to EQ Value	Ratio less County Average Ratio	Above/(Below) County Average	Total Housing Units	\$280 Fee per Housing Unit for FT, \$200 Fee for PT
1 Buena Vista Township	Atlantic	FT	77,446	107,848	170,544	3,000	1.759%	2,507	689	1,838	1.704%	-0.055%	Below	2,827	791,560
2 Estell Manor City	Atlantic	FT	120,169	133,019	170,544	3,000	1.759%	2,734	649	1,838	1.567%	-0.192%	Below	546	152,880
3 Folsom Borough	Atlantic	FT	105,020	119,151	170,544	3,000	1.759%	2,447	630	1,817	1.525%	-0.234%	Below	702	196,560
4 Port Republic City	Atlantic	FT	140,260	181,004	170,544	3,000	1.759%	3,718	664	3,054	1.687%	-0.072%	Below	389	108,920
5 Weymouth Township	Atlantic	FT	112,227	138,092	170,544	3,000	1.759%	3,225	632	1,693	1.226%	-0.533%	Below	909	254,520
6 Bass River Township	Burlington	FT	95,695	123,191	161,025	3,458	2.147%	3,041	683	2,358	1.914%	-0.233%	Below	602	168,560
7 Hainesport Township	Burlington	FT	147,403	195,236	161,025	3,458	2.147%	4,334	855	3,678	1.884%	-0.263%	Below	1,555	435,400
8 Shamong Township	Burlington	FT	173,458	230,142	161,025	3,458	2.147%	5,589	683	4,906	2.132%	-0.016%	Below	2,175	608,000
9 Southampton Township	Burlington	FT	129,529	148,788	161,025	3,458	2.147%	3,600	706	2,894	1.945%	-0.203%	Below	4,751	1,330,280
10 Washington Township	Burlington	FT	100,606	155,495	161,025	3,458	2.147%	2,670	656	2,014	1.295%	-0.852%	Below	1,171	47,880
11 Woodland Township	Burlington	FT	86,964	101,989	161,025	3,458	2.147%	2,313	666	1,647	1.615%	-0.533%	Below	348	125,440
12 Wrightstown Borough	Burlington	FT	90,290	101,989	161,025	3,458	2.147%	1,691	631	1,060	1.128%	-1.020%	Below	339	94,920
13 Commercial Township	Cumberland	FT	42,913	54,506	80,666	1,577	1.955%	1,321	632	689	1.264%	-0.691%	Below	2,171	607,880
14 Downe Township	Cumberland	FT	56,863	68,002	80,666	1,577	1.955%	1,761	657	1,104	1.623%	-0.331%	Below	1,134	317,520
15 Fairfield Borough	Cumberland	FT	72,235	76,960	80,666	1,577	1.955%	1,810	640	1,170	1.520%	-0.435%	Below	1,915	536,200
16 Lawrence Township	Cumberland	FT	66,010	75,332	80,666	1,577	1.955%	1,989	651	1,348	1.769%	-0.166%	Below	1,023	286,440
17 Maurice River Township	Cumberland	FT	73,947	84,731	80,666	1,577	1.955%	2,284	653	1,631	1.722%	-0.233%	Below	1,461	409,080
18 Stow Creek Township	Cumberland	FT	65,776	81,073	80,666	1,577	1.955%	1,551	609	909	1.488%	-0.467%	Below	560	156,800
19 Alexandria Township	Hunterdon	FT	328,267	295,283	274,093	5,092	1.858%	6,010	693	5,317	1.801%	-0.057%	Below	1,598	447,440
20 East Amwell Township	Hunterdon	FT	171,268	263,804	274,093	5,092	1.858%	5,276	641	4,585	1.738%	-0.120%	Below	1,624	454,720
21 Glen Gardner Borough	Hunterdon	FT	178,304	196,651	274,093	5,092	1.858%	4,326	685	3,641	1.852%	-0.006%	Below	829	232,120
22 Kingwood Township	Hunterdon	FT	143,342	223,344	274,093	5,092	1.858%	4,006	689	3,307	1.481%	-0.377%	Below	1,422	398,160
23 Lebanon Borough	Hunterdon	FT	158,576	247,002	274,093	5,092	1.858%	4,605	689	3,925	1.589%	-0.269%	Below	477	135,560
24 Stockton Borough	Hunterdon	FT	160,311	262,289	274,093	5,092	1.858%	4,740	669	4,041	1.541%	-0.317%	Below	288	72,240
25 Union Township	Hunterdon	FT	284,317	304,512	274,093	5,092	1.858%	5,807	667	5,149	1.689%	-0.170%	Below	1,725	488,000
26 Victoria Gardens Borough	Morris	FT	87,857	104,931	93,879	1,945	2.072%	2,892	663	2,220	1.521%	-0.554%	Below	588	164,640
27 Alloway Township	Salem	FT	91,617	100,491	93,879	1,945	2.072%	2,485	658	1,827	1.818%	-0.254%	Below	595	278,600
28 Mannington Township	Salem	FT	49,550	60,221	93,879	1,945	2.072%	1,305	649	656	1.089%	-0.982%	Below	573	160,440
29 Oldmans Township	Salem	FT	66,529	88,819	93,879	1,945	2.072%	2,361	662	1,699	1.857%	-0.115%	Below	694	194,320
30 Pilesgrove Township	Salem	FT	110,095	136,340	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,485	674	2,761	2.040%	-0.032%	Below	1,261	355,080
31 Quinton Township	Salem	FT	171,995	86,835	93,879	1,945	2.072%	2,122	682	1,440	1.668%	-0.413%	Below	1,133	317,240
32 Upper Pittsgrove Township	Somerset	FT	223,239	259,580	93,879	1,945	2.072%	2,048	666	1,362	1.597%	-0.475%	Below	1,250	350,000
33 Millstone Borough	Somerset	FT	208,176	237,196	93,879	1,945	2.072%	4,747	667	4,050	1.560%	-0.513%	Below	1,773	48,440
34 Rocky Hill Borough	Somerset	FT	142,846	188,825	93,879	1,945	2.072%	5,104	672	4,432	1.810%	-0.291%	Below	295	82,600
35 Andover Borough	Sussex	FT	134,513	161,810	93,879	1,945	2.072%	4,127	709	3,418	1.810%	-0.291%	Below	273	76,440
36 Branchville Borough	Sussex	FT	180,119	168,336	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,050	646	2,404	1.486%	-0.616%	Below	377	105,560
37 Frankford Township	Sussex	FT	170,015	236,922	93,879	1,945	2.072%	4,088	687	3,411	2.014%	-0.067%	Below	2,285	642,600
38 Fredon Township	Sussex	FT	180,119	236,922	93,879	1,945	2.072%	5,213	694	4,519	1.907%	-0.194%	Below	1,019	286,320
39 Hampton Township	Sussex	FT	128,757	171,037	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,361	688	3,361	1.965%	-0.136%	Below	2,026	567,280
40 Lafayette Township	Sussex	FT	123,182	181,310	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,937	689	3,238	1.786%	-0.315%	Below	759	223,720
41 Montague Township	Sussex	FT	90,468	118,151	93,879	1,945	2.072%	2,604	690	1,914	1.620%	-0.481%	Below	1,588	444,640
42 Sandyston Township	Sussex	FT	104,685	131,464	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,005	679	2,326	1.769%	-0.332%	Below	907	253,960
43 Welpack Township	Sussex	FT	43,953	45,856	93,879	1,945	2.072%	671	600	71	0.155%	-1.946%	Below	34	9,520
44 Allamuchy Township	Warren	FT	237,461	225,788	179,183	3,514	1.961%	4,369	702	3,607	1.588%	-0.364%	Below	1,774	496,720
45 Frelinghuysen Township	Warren	FT	187,734	159,666	179,183	3,514	1.961%	3,671	688	2,983	1.860%	-0.104%	Below	795	211,400
46 Hardwick Township	Warren	FT	154,299	178,401	179,183	3,514	1.961%	3,822	705	3,117	1.747%	-0.214%	Below	530	148,400
47 Harmony Township	Warren	FT	153,915	153,700	179,183	3,514	1.961%	2,757	676	2,081	1.354%	-0.607%	Below	1,076	301,280
48 Hope Township	Warren	FT	122,090	166,959	179,183	3,514	1.961%	3,625	690	2,935	1.737%	-0.224%	Below	747	209,160
49 Kroulton Township	Warren	FT	145,540	164,489	179,183	3,514	1.961%	3,850	711	3,139	1.908%	-0.053%	Below	1,135	317,800
50 White Township	Warren	FT	217,950	184,375	179,183	3,514	1.961%	3,169	660	2,529	1.372%	-0.589%	Below	1,770	495,600
															15,559,640
															3,447,000
															19,036,640
51 Chesterfield Township	Burlington	PT	175,743	243,613	161,025	3,458	2.147%	5,503	695	4,808	1.974%	-0.174%	Below	924	184,800
52 Mansfield Township	Burlington	PT	156,596	212,653	161,025	3,458	2.147%	5,078	696	4,392	2.081%	-0.067%	Below	2,122	424,400
53 New Hanover Township	Burlington	PT	137,241	125,897	161,025	3,458	2.147%	2,300	663	1,637	1.300%	-0.847%	Below	1,351	276,200
54 North Hanover Township	Burlington	PT	144,328	182,787	161,025	3,458	2.147%	3,514	663	3,702	1.560%	-0.589%	Below	2,670	534,000
55 Springfield Township	Burlington	PT	124,703	183,955	161,025	3,458	2.147%	4,401	699	3,702	2.012%	-0.355%	Below	1,138	227,600
56 South Hampton Township	Gloucester	PT	146,619	182,703	161,025	3,458	2.147%	4,577	686	3,881	2.124%	-0.355%	Below	829	165,800
57 Franklin Township	Hunterdon	PT	290,111	288,438	274,093	5,092	1.858%	5,630	706	5,124	1.776%	-0.081%	Below	1,125	225,000
58 Holland Township	Hunterdon	PT	245,382	259,911	274,093	5,092	1.858%	4,722	677	4,045	1.566%	-0.301%	Below	1,942	388,400
59 Stillwater Township	Sussex	PT	150,876	159,283	176,708	3,713	2.101%	3,848	708	3,140	1.971%	-0.130%	Below	2,030	406,000
60 Blairstown Township	Warren	PT	163,284	220,952	179,183	3,514	1.961%	4,335	684	3,651	1.652%	-0.309%	Below	2,136	427,200
61 Oxford Township	Warren	PT	113,990	158,099	179,183	3,514	1.961%	3,696	676	3,020	1.910%	-0.051%	Below	938	187,600

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o
Municipalities	County	FT/PT	Average Residential Property Value	EQ Residential Property Value	Respective County Average EQ Property Value	Respective County Average Net (of rebates) Property Taxes	Respective County Average Ratio of Taxes to EQ Value	Average Residential Property Taxes	Average Property Tax Rebate	Average Net (of rebates) Residential Property Taxes	Total Housing Units	% of EQ Property Value Compared to County Average	Property Value Above (Below) County Average	\$280 Fee per Housing Unit for FT, \$200 Fee for PT
												e/f		(\$280 or \$200) * i
62 Tabernacle Township	Burlington	FT	146,226	188,758	161,025	3,458	2.47%	4,988	690	4,298	2,385	123.4%	Above	667,800
63 Deerfield Township	Cumberland	FT	102,597	83,785	80,666	1,577	1.955%	2,701	680	2,021	1,065	111.3%	Above	298,200
64 Greenwich Township	Cumberland	FT	97,082	81,404	80,666	1,577	1.955%	2,556	687	1,869	361	100.9%	Above	101,080
65 Hopewell Township	Cumberland	FT	92,188	93,430	80,666	1,577	1.955%	2,661	663	1,998	1,683	115.8%	Above	471,240
66 Shiloh Borough	Cumberland	FT	76,749	81,544	80,666	1,577	1.955%	2,621	660	1,961	204	101.1%	Above	57,120
67 Upper Deerfield Township	Cumberland	FT	96,240	98,982	80,666	1,577	1.955%	2,766	654	2,112	2,881	122.7%	Above	806,680
68 Bethel Township	Hunterdon	FT	297,614	317,252	274,033	5,092	1.859%	7,659	700	6,959	1,303	115.7%	Above	364,840
69 Millstone Township	Monmouth	FT	335,219	367,121	362,482	5,473	1.510%	7,023	686	6,337	2,797	101.3%	Above	783,160
70 Pittsgrove Township	Salem	FT	144,475	117,852	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,351	676	2,675	3,155	125.5%	Above	863,400
71 Green Township	Sussex	FT	171,609	250,269	178,708	3,713	2.107%	6,099	694	5,365	1,089	141.6%	Above	289,320
72 Franklin Township	Warren	FT	216,168	187,564	179,183	3,514	1.961%	4,520	694	3,826	1,019	104.7%	Above	285,920
73 Eimer Borough	Salem	PT	84,851	107,939	93,879	1,945	2.072%	3,294	693	2,601	557	115.0%	Above	111,400
														111,400
														5,129,660
														24,166,400

Municipalities Not Impacted

74 Corbin City	Atlantic	FT
75 Dennis Township	Cape May	FT
76 Upper Township	Cape May	FT
77 Woodbine Borough	Cape May	FT
78 Bloomsbury Borough	Hunterdon	FT
79 Hampton Borough	Hunterdon	FT
80 Millford Borough	Hunterdon	FT
81 Farmingdale Borough	Monmouth	FT
82 Roosevelt Borough	Monmouth	FT
83 Shrewsbury Township	Monmouth	FT
84 Upper Freehold Township	Monmouth	FT
85 Eagleswood Township	Ocean	FT
86 Sussex Borough	Sussex	FT
87 Wantage Township	Sussex	FT
88 Liberty Township	Warren	FT
89 Fieldsboro Borough	Burlington	PT
90 Pemberton Borough	Burlington	PT
91 Calton Borough	Hunterdon	PT
92 Frenchtown Borough	Hunterdon	PT

All property tax and value data based on CY 2004 information found at www.nj.gov/idec/igs/taxes/taxmenu.shtm

Housing unit data found at www.census.gov