Discussion Points

1a. The Governor's budget incorporates an estimated $5.183 billion over two fiscal years in federal stimulus funding provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. According to a table on page 42 of the Governor's abbreviated budget, the State will use $3.074 billion ($854 million in FY 2009 and $2.220 billion in FY 10) from ARRA for budget relief. In addition to these funds which will offset revenue shortfalls, $2.109 billion will be used for new or expanded programs or initiatives. The ARRA allocates funds to states both by formula and by competitive awards. Most Executive departments anticipate stimulus funding in either FY 2009, FY 2010 or both.

- **Question:** Please itemize the federal stimulus funding, other than portions of the $3.074 billion allocated for budget relief, included in the department's budget, by fiscal year and federal program, setting forth program goals and eligible uses together with the amount for state administrative expenses and the amount for allocation to local public and private recipients, respectively. Please identify intended and actual recipients and the process by which the department determines recipients and funding awards. Are there ARRA funds that flow through your department for which the State has no discretion? Please also set forth the timetable for obtaining federal approval of funding, obligation and allocation of funding to recipients, and use by recipients. Could any of this funding be used to offset other State appropriations, and if so, what programs and in what amount? What additional positions, if any, have been created and will be filled with these funds? If this money is being used for new or expanded activities, will the new or expanded activities be continued in FY 2011? If so, how will they be funded?

- **Question:** In addition to funding incorporated in the FY 2010 budget, what specific competitive grant opportunities has the department identified that it is eligible to pursue, has applied for, and has been awarded, respectively?

The chart below details the federal stimulus funding the Department is applying for, the corresponding purpose/goals for each program, and the amount allowable under the grant for administrative expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Amount Applying For</th>
<th>Formula or Competitive</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Purpose/Goal</th>
<th>Administrative Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 COPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>$45,763,450</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Address the full-time sworn-officer needs. Provides direct funding to hire and/or rehire career law enforcement officers in an effort to create and preserve jobs and to increase their community policing capacity. CHRP funds will support entry-level salary and fringe to career law enforcement officers for 36 months. At the conclusion of the federal funding, grantees must retain positions for an additional 12 months. Will need to request additional funding for the salaries in the 4th year or move the positions to a dedicated (non-DSS) funding source.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CHRP) – State Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA VOCA Victim Assistance</td>
<td>$1,074,000</td>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Support provisions of services to victims of crime</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Amount Applying For</th>
<th>Formula or Competitive</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Purpose/Goal</th>
<th>Administrative Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA VOCA Victim Compensation</td>
<td>$1,410,671</td>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Provide financial assistance to, or on behalf of, victims of crime</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA STOP VAWA</td>
<td>$3,624,711</td>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>$1,208,237</td>
<td>Support communities in efforts to obtain victim service personnel that respond to violent crimes against women; to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement, prosecution strategies and victim services in cases involving violent crimes against women.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAQ Task Force)</td>
<td>$901,049.77</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Increase investigative capabilities of law enforcement in the detection, investigation and apprehension of Internet crimes against children offenses or offenders, including technology-facilitated child exploitation offenses</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA Local Youth Mentoring Initiative</td>
<td>Grants being submitted – Amount is unknown</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Develop, implement and expand neighborhood mentoring programs.</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA Byrne Competitive</td>
<td>Grants being submitted – Amount is unknown</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Improve criminal justice systems; provide assistance to victims of crime; provide programs and efforts, such as training and technical assistance, to strategically address the needs of justice systems and communities.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09 ARRA Justice Assistance Grants (JAG)</td>
<td>$29,754,315</td>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Details on allocation provided below.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department allocated the funding for FY 09 JAG Recovery Act funding based on the Governor's Anti-Crime Initiative, focusing on enforcement, prevention and re-entry. The specific details of the allocation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Total Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Enforcement Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Electronic Surveillance Support Initiative</td>
<td>$1,500,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Intelligence Led Policing Initiative</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Plate Readers for Investigations Initiative</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Crimes Initiative</td>
<td>$322,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Jurisdictional Gangs, Guns, and Narcotics Task Force Support</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Witness and Relocation Assistance Program (SWRAP)</td>
<td>$703,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Prosecutor Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force Support</td>
<td>$3,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs and Violent Crime Intelligence Initiative</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Violent Crime Suppression Initiative</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Enforcement Initiative Total</strong></td>
<td>$13,452,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Justice Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Management and Resident Rating IT Application</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Step Discharge Center</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Family Reunification</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Incentives to Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) Youth</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Treatment Services</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Justice Initiatives Total</strong></td>
<td>$753,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National-Model Youth Training Job Development Program</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Total Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Based Truancy Prevention Programs</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Initiatives Total</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reentry Initiatives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jail-Based Strategy Day Reporting Centers and Discharge Planning</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Planning – Mental Health Issues</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Reentry Initiative</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Accountability Conference Teams (PACT)</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Safe Surrender – North Central South</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Outcomes and Impact of Juvenile Reentry Services and Sanctions</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation Risks/Needs Assessment</td>
<td>$622,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentry Initiatives Total</td>
<td>$4,622,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Justice Information Systems</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Scan</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Automated Management Systems Enhancements</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFM – DV Forms</td>
<td>$859,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYFS Notice of Placement</td>
<td>$151,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Information Systems Total</td>
<td>$5,034,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Program Administration                           | $892,715        |

Total Allocation 2009 JAG Recovery ARRA          | $29,754,315

The process for awarding subgrants under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grant programs will not differ from the Department’s normal grant award process. For the competitive grants, a Notice of Availability of Funds (NOAF) will be published in the New Jersey Register; applications will be reviewed for completeness and eligibility, and then objectively scored based on established criteria. Subgrant awards will be issued based on scores, taking into account geographic location in some instances and crime statistics in others.

The solicitations for the ARRA funds include specific guidelines as to how the funds are to be used. The Department of Law and Public Safety intends to use each allocation of funds for the purpose of the program, as stated in the program solicitation. For example, the FY09 ARRA STOP VAWA Program requires that of the total award amount, at least 5% must be allocated for state and local courts including juvenile courts, at least 25% must be allocated for law enforcement, at least 25% must be allocated for prosecutors and at least 30% must be allocated for nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services, of which at least 10% must be distributed to culturally specific community-based organizations.

The program solicitations list anticipated start dates for the programs to be July 1st and October 1st of 2009. Program awards have various time periods, ranging from 12 months to 48 months. The Department anticipates beginning the formal subgrant award process as soon as the award documents are executed by the federal government.

One program available to the Department that could be used to offset State appropriations is the OJJDP FY09 Recovery Act Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program. This program is exempt from the non-supplanting requirement of the OJP Financial Guide. The Department of Law and Public Safety, Division of State Police, applied for $901,000 under this program. Should this be awarded, the salaries for four troopers could be supported by this funding. Until the grants have been awarded to the Department, the Department is unable to project the potential savings to the State.
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The Department does not anticipate hiring any full time employees under the ARRA funding. However, the Division of State Police anticipates applying for the COPS Hiring Recovery Program, which is a competitive grant program under the ARRA. The Division of State Police will be seeking funds in the amount of approximately $45.8 million (over a three year period) to hire up to 150 new State Troopers to address attrition. Since this is a competitive program, the Department is unsure of the actual amount of funds it will receive, if any, in the future.

Many of the activities that will be funded with the ARRA monies will mirror or complement activities that are currently being implemented with other grant funds. As stated above, the ARRA grants are expected to run in the range of 12 to 48 months after the start date of the grant. Therefore, some of the programs will continue into FY 2011 with federal funding.

Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness

There are only two federal homeland security grant programs that will be funded under the ARRA including $150 million nationwide for the Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) and $150 million for the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP). In addition, there is a new $210 million firefighter assistance program for fire house construction and renovation. All three programs are competitive and neither of the programs will result in direct awards to the OHSP. Funding under the PSGP is awarded on a formula basis to the nation’s regional port sectors. In New Jersey, ARRA Port Security Grant Program funding will be awarded by DHS to the PANYNJ for Sector NYNJ initiatives and to the Maritime Exchange for the Delaware River and Bay for Sector Delaware Bay initiatives. Both of these entities serve as the eligible Fiduciary Agents to apply to DHS for both sectors’ formula share of the funding. Project determination is subsequently determined by each sector’s Area Maritime Security Committee in consultation with the U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port. The OHSP along with other port security partners are eligible to submit projects that support regional port initiatives in both sectors. PSGP funding is to be used exclusively to fund gaps and priorities that have been identified each region’s strategic risk management plans. PSGP funding has limited ability to fund positions, with those being focused primarily on training and exercising in and around the port areas. The OHSP has not created positions funded under the PSGP due to the competitive nature of the funding stream and the requirement to provide cash match funds.

Funding under the ARRA TSGP will be awarded on a competitive basis to the nation’s transit agencies. In New Jersey, the New Jersey Transit, PATH, PANYNJ and PATCO are eligible transit agencies to seek funding under this program. The OHSP does not receive funding under TSGP nor does it administer the program, rather, funds are directly awarded to each of the aforementioned agencies.

Grant guidelines for the new $210 million fire house construction and renovation grant program established under the ARRA have not been released and little detail is available at this time. It is anticipated that DHS will solicit applications on a competitive basis from local fire departments seeking funding to construct new or renovate existing fire houses. The local fire departments are expected to apply directly to DHS. The OHSP does not anticipate it will be required to administer any part of this new grant program.

The OHSP continues to explore all funding opportunities that support its mission. A daily review of the Federal Register and grant funding publications serve as the basis for identifying
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potential new revenue sources. A good example of this is the FFY09 Emergency Operations Center grant program that was not incorporated into the FY2010 budget. This program was pursued by the OSHP and has resulted in $3 million in unanticipated grant funding being awarded to the state for EOC construction and renovation projects in the counties of Essex, Morris, Hudson and Atlantic.

1b. Federal enactments and budget proposals often significantly impact State programs and fiscal resources. The Department of Law and Public Safety anticipates receiving $239.3 million in federal funds in FY 2010, which is an increase of $34.3 million or 16.7 percent from the previous fiscal year.

- **Question:** What specific increases or decreases in federal funding, outside of ARRA funding, are anticipated in FY 2010? What specific new or revised federal mandates or matching requirements are expected? What impact would these changes have on the department's resources and activities in FY 2010? Please provide details regarding any local impact from these changes.

The amount of non-ARRA federal funds anticipated in the FY 2010 Governor's Recommendation represents an overall decrease of approximately $7.9 million. This funding reduction consists of:

**Racial Profiling Prevention**
It is anticipated that the grant for Racial Profiling Prevention within the Division of Highway Traffic Safety will be reduced by $2 million.

Federal funding was awarded to the State to establish an incentive grant program to prohibit racial profiling. New Jersey qualified for this grant funding in Federal Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007. Funding for this program was available to qualifying states for a period of two years. Funding was no longer available after Federal Fiscal Year 2007. In accordance with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration federal requirements, awarded grant funding must be closed after each federal budget fiscal year and new grant funding established in the following year. In order to comply with this federal requirement, the State must provide grant authority to enable grant awards to be established in the new budget fiscal year. The current $1.0 million funding authority will provide grant awards to two (2) current subgrantees participating in this Federal Fiscal Year 2007 program.

**Juvenile Justice Commission**
It is anticipated that the Juvenile Justice Commission federal funding will have a net decrease of $3.654 million. The following programs will be impacted: Juvenile Accountability Incentive ($152,000); IDEA Handicapped ($226,000); Juvenile Mentoring Program $9,000; Americorps $101,000; Title I – D ($87,000); High Risk Youth Offender ($1,000,000); Title V Funding ($1,450,000); Juvenile Justice Delinquency ($448,000); and Juvenile Monitoring Unit ($401,000).
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Victim Compensation Award

While the Victims of Crime Compensation Office is anticipating a $3.5 million reduction in non-ARRA federal grant funding, the Department has applied for a Victim Compensation federal grant through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

The non-ARRA federal grant is based on a Certification for State Claims Account minus restitution, subrogation, and refunds for the period October 1, 2007 to September 30, 2008. The grant award is based on 60% of the net result of the State Claims Account amount reported in the final certification to the federal government. The federal funding for Fiscal Year 2010 is based on a more accurate expenditure funding level.

Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness

The OHSP serves as the designated State Administrative Agency responsible for the program administration and implementation of a number of federal homeland security grant program funding streams. The OHSP anticipates receiving approximately $83 million in SFY10 which is a 5% increase when compared to SFY09 ($79 million). The 5% increase is mainly attributable to increases in the Buffer Zone Protection Program and the new Emergency Operations Center grant program. The OHSP administers the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP), Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI), Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP), Interoperability Emergency Communication Grant Program (IECGP), UASI Non Profit Grant Program (NSGP), Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG), Citizen Corps (CC), Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) and the Emergency Operations Centers (EOC) grant program.

The OHSP is also receiving $5 million in contracted planning support under the FFY08 Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant (RCPG) program. These funds along with NYC’s $5 million share were consolidated in order to provide $10 million in contracted planning support to identify, plan for and address gaps in the event of various catastrophic incidents. The OHSP also receives Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) subgrant funding from Sector NYNJ and Sector Delaware Bay. For the FFY08 PSGP funding cycle, OHSP is anticipated to receive $6.6 million in SFY10.

Federal DHS funding under the Transit Security Grant Program is not administered by the OHSP, rather, those funds are awarded to and administered by the New Jersey Transit, PATH, PANYNJ, and PATCO. It is important to note Port Security and Transit Security Grants provide funding for New Jersey Projects which are approved by regional port security and transit security area-wide committees. New Jersey’s amounts are predicated on competition from the various transit agencies and port partners from NYC, NY State, Connecticut, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Delaware and the ability to provide state matching funds. Funding levels for New Jersey’s port and transit initiatives fluctuate depending on the projects submitted and the ability to match with state funds. It should be noted that each year the amounts of funding available to New Jersey for which it can compete has increased. For FFY09, approximately $213 million dollars is available for regional port security and transit security projects.

The $83 million estimated for SFY10 is not inclusive of potential funding under the FFY09 Port Security Grant Program or the FFY09 Stimulus Port Security Grant Program competitive funds which could considerably increase the amount of anticipated funding for SFY10.
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New/revised federal mandates and matching requirements:

In terms of new federal requirements, DHS has been progressively requiring applicants to identify matching funds as a requirement of funding eligibility. This is a pattern we can not ignore in our fiscal planning. Several programs, including Port Security, Transit Security, and UASI Non Profit, have required match funding over the past several years. For FFY08/09, a 25% match is required for the new Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant (RCPG) program. For New Jersey and New York UASIs, the 25% match for the FY08/09 RCPG will be approximately $6 million. The new Emergency Operations Center grant program requires a 25% cash match which Atlantic, Hudson, Morris and Essex will be required to identify and contribute $1 million.

Potential Match Impacts:

As mentioned above, the new FFY08/09 RCPG program will require New Jersey, NYC/NY State and Connecticut to contribute matching funds of approximately $6 million in order to participate in $17 million of federal catastrophic funding for the tri-state region. The 25% cash match requirement of the Port Security Grant Program will also impact the ability of OHSP to pursue specialized port security training efforts that will enhance the capabilities of first responders in/around the northern and southern port areas of New Jersey. The 25% cash match requirement for port funding also limits OHSP's ability to aggressively pursue planning and interdependency efforts in an effort to prepare, prevent, protect and recover from an attack in and around both port sectors. The Port Security Grant Program can drive multi-million dollar projects, underscoring the importance of state matching capability.

Local impact from these changes:

The OHSP anticipates DHS will continue to move towards requiring matching funds to be a requirement for all federal homeland security grant programs. To date, however, matching requirements have not been placed upon New Jersey's 21 counties in terms of the federal homeland security grant funds OHSP is required to pass through to local units of government. If matching funds are applied to the pass through grant program, local units of government may find themselves in a very difficult financial position of being able to identify matching funds in order to be eligible to receive federal homeland security grant dollars.

**SFY10 Projected Match Requirements**

| FFY09 PSCP Sector Del Bay | $666,666 | (25% cash) |
| FFY09 PSCP Sector NYNJ  | $1,000,000 | (25% cash) |
| FFY09 EMPG Tide Telemetry | $233,315 | (50% cash) |
| FFY07 PSIC              | $1,000,000 | (20% cash) |
| Total Projected SFY10 Match Need | $2,899,981 |

2. Over the past several years, the overall staffing level in the Executive branch has been reduced through restrictions on hiring and an early retirement program. The FY 2010 budget proposal envisions continuation of the hiring restrictions coupled with possible furloughs or further reductions in positions.
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- **Question:** How has the reduction in staffing affected your department? What strategies has the department employed to deal with staff reductions? What projects, work products or functions has the department discontinued or deferred because of staffing levels? Will the department be able to accommodate furloughs in FY 2010 without increasing spending for overtime? If not, how does the department plan to respond to the Governor's furlough directive, particularly within the Division of State Police.

Since Governor Corzine took office in January 2006, overall the Department staff has been reduced by 10% (net). However, the impact on each division is as follows:

**DEPARTMENTAL CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>JANUARY 2006</th>
<th>JANUARY 2009</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>% VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>(196)</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>(222)</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE MEDICAL EXAMINER</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE POLICE - ENLISTED*</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE POLICE - CIVILIANS</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER AFFAIRS</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL BOARDS</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL RIGHTS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACING</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTIMS OF CRIME COMPENSATION</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMING</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE ATHLETIC CONTROL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,992</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>(896)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes current State Police Recruit Class.

More specifically, the percentage decrease in the number of our attorneys and investigators is much steeper. The Department is down 159 attorneys in all divisions, or approximately 18% since January 2006, and down 256 civil and criminal investigators in all our divisions, or 25%. The Department has been limited in replacing attorneys and investigators. Over the past year, majority of the attorneys hired work in critical areas such as DYFS and were funded through Dedicated Client Services.

Last year's ERI program was offered to many of the Department's long-term, experienced employees, including: attorneys, investigators, and managers. The loss of these individuals has added to the operational challenges. Since last year, the Department's staffing component has been reduced by total of 301 employees. Of that amount, approximately 138 are attributable to the Early Retirement Incentive (ERI) program offered last year. A total of 21 employees were granted an extension to the ERI and will be leaving the Department by June 30, 2009.

To deal with the administrative staffing reductions, the Attorney General implemented a plan to consolidate the administrative functions within the divisions at the Department level. The reorganization of sections that perform similar responsibilities will better serve New Jersey by streamlining efforts, reducing operational costs and improving administrative functions. The units in the consolidation plan are Human Resources, Information Technology, Budget,
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Finance, and Facilities sections within the Office of the Attorney General. The first phase of the consolidation includes the Divisions of Law, Criminal Justice, Civil Rights, Alcoholic Beverage Control, and the Racing Commission. The Department plans to expand the administrative consolidation throughout the remaining divisions during FY 2010. The second phase of the administrative consolidation will include the following divisions: State Police, Highway Traffic Safety, Consumer Affairs, and the Victims of Crime Compensation Office.

There will be no increased overtime as a result of the Governor's Furlough Directive; and the enlisted members of the State Police are exempt.

Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness

The reduction in staffing due to the Early Retirement Incentive (ERI) program has had a negligible effect on the Office of Homeland Security & Preparedness (OHSP) since only two individuals retired as a result of the ERI Program.

Strategies we will employ to deal with further staff reductions include our office conducting a “bottom-up” review of our organizational structure to determine appropriate alignment with the requirements under EO#5. We will see if there are functional areas that could be either realigned or eliminated based on current responsibilities and/or threats to the State.

OHSP will be able to accommodate furloughs in FY2010 without increasing spending for overtime.

The Election Law Enforcement Commission will respond directly.

3. The FY 2009 appropriations act anticipated that $25 million in procurement savings would be achieved by Executive departments. A chart on page 75 of the Budget in Brief categorizes those savings and indicates they will continue into FY 2010. The FY 2010 budget includes another $25 million from procurement savings (Budget in Brief, Appendix I, page 8).

- **Question:** Please indicate the FY 2009 amount of procurement savings achieved by your department, by the categories set forth in the referenced table, and the sources of those savings by department program? What is the annual amount of these savings continued into FY 2010? How have these reductions affected the department? What projects, work products or functions has the department discontinued or deferred in order to achieve these savings?

The Office of Management and Budget is providing the response to this question on behalf of all agencies statewide.

4. According to testimony by Department of the Treasury officials at an October 20, 2008 Senate State Government Committee’s oversight hearing on the State’s Motor Pool, the State possesses 10,000 vehicles at an operational cost in excess of $20 million. Of this amount, the Department of Law and Public Safety was reported to possess 3,000 vehicles, of which 2,100 are assigned to the Division of State Police. Central Motor Pool staff further stated that the Department of Law and Public Safety has jurisdiction over which personnel receive cars and which personnel do not. In FY 2009, $7.274 million was set-aside by the Department of Law
and Public Safety for the replacement and purchase of State Police vehicles through a line of credit.

The FY 2010 Governor's Budget Recommendation indicates that there are 15,446 vehicles in the Bureau of Transportation Services (State Central Motor Pool) within the Department of Treasury (page G-5).

- **Question:** For the estimated 900 Department of Law and Public Safety vehicles that are not used by the Division of State Police, please provide an accounting by division of the purposes for which these vehicles are used. Please indicate whether or not the department can eliminate any of these vehicles from the fleet and justify your response. Is the department complying with State regulations by providing mileage details on a monthly basis? How is the department tracking and administering EZ Pass for all of its cars, including those utilized by the Division of State Police?

- **Question:** What is the department's FY 2010 spending plan for State Police vehicles? Please provide a time-table and line of credit payment schedule for acquisition of new vehicles, assuming the budget is enacted as recommended. After this proposed acquisition, what would be the size of the State Police patrol fleet? What proportion of the new vehicles acquired in FY 2009 is to replace vehicles retired from the fleet, and what proportion is to expand the fleet? What percentage of the fleet would have been considered consent versus non-consent decere vehicles? How many of these cars would be considered fuel efficient, including hybrid or alternative fuel? If any, what is the criteria used for determining “fuel efficiency?” What level of funding would be needed in FY 2011 for all line of credit payments on vehicles acquired prior to FY 2010?

The Department of Law and Public Safety is down 89 vehicles since last fiscal year. Most recently, the Department cut 74 vehicles from the fleet. The 74 vehicles cut from the fleet were sent back to Central Motor Pool in April 2009.

The following will summarize the purposes (by Division) for which the vehicles are used:

**Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC)**
The ABC regulates the commerce of alcoholic beverages within the State of New Jersey.

Vehicles are used by ABC for: undercover surveillance operations; attend court appearances; conduct training; and make arrests. In addition, Investigators go to businesses throughout the State to determine that proper licensing has been acquired and that the establishments are complying with the law.

**State Athletic Control Board (SACB)**
The SACB’s main purpose is to protect the safety and well being of all participants and promote the public confidence and trust in the regulatory process and conduct of public boxing and other combative sports.

The vehicle is used to conduct regulatory duties for statewide athletic events throughout the state.
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Division on Civil Rights (DCR)
The DCR is charged with enforcing the Law Against Discrimination within the State of New Jersey. Accordingly, the mission of the DCR is the eradication of illegal discrimination.

Vehicles are used by DCR for: undercover surveillance operations, attend court appearances, and issuance of violations.

Division of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
The DCA protects the public from fraud, deceit and misrepresentation in the sale of goods and services. The DCA is also responsible for the regulation of more than 90 boards and bureau’s for the State of New Jersey. The DCA supervises the activities of 41 boards and committees, regulating more than 80 professions and occupations. Approximately 600,000 New Jerseyans are licensed by these boards.

Some other areas of responsibility for the DCA are as follows: the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Unit resolves disputes without having to go through the traditional court system; the Bureau of Securities is New Jersey’s securities regulatory agency; the Office of Consumer Protection serves as the chief investigative section for consumer complaints and enforces the Consumer Fraud Act and its regulations; the Legalized Games of Chance Control Commission oversees the operation of games conducted pursuant to the Bingo and Raffle Licensing Laws; and the Office of Weights and Measures is responsible for ensuring that all commercial weighing and measuring devices accurately measure the commodities sold to consumers.

Vehicles are used to: interview complainants, witnesses, suspects and other sources of information; taking statements; conducting surveillances; conducting covert operations; assisting other law enforcement agencies in investigations; executing inspection warrants; seizing evidence and conducting related inspections and audits. Other examples of vehicles use includes: conducting inspections to ensure unit pricing being enforced; testing of weighing and measuring devices, such as scales and gas meters; testing gas to ensure proper octane; and testing meats to ensure grade A and fat percentages are accurate. DCA also inspects facilities, such as Pharmacies and Cosmetology shops, to ensure premises meet standards in order to open; and to ensure, once licensed, that the facilities are clean and in compliance.

Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ)
The DCJ is charged with the responsibility to detect, enforce and prosecute the criminal business of the State through the uniform and efficient administration of New Jersey’s criminal laws. In addition to its direct law enforcement operations, the DCJ provides oversight and coordination within New Jersey’s law enforcement community. The activities of the DCJ are conducted through a staff consisting of Deputy Attorneys General, Investigators, and professional and clerical personnel.

It is the goal of the DCJ to coordinate law enforcement efforts and cooperate to share resources within criminal justice communities on the state, county and municipal levels, to ensure the safety and security of all New Jersey citizens.

Vehicles are used by the DCJ investigative and legal staff for: law enforcement investigations, surveillance, enforcement, arrest, executing search warrants, extraditions, court appearances,
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witness transportation, victim transportation, witness relocations, taking statements, transporting evidence, training, and on-call 24 hour duty.

Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC)
The JJC provides a continuum of care for juveniles placed under its supervision including residential community homes programs, secure care facilities and parole services.

There are three primary responsibilities for JJC:

1. The care and custody of juvenile offenders committed to the agency by the courts.
2. To provide support for local efforts to provide services to at risk and court involved youth.
3. The supervision of youth on juvenile parole.

The vehicles are used by JJC staff in the care, custody and parole of juvenile offenders. Some examples of vehicle use are: transportation to and from court, training, medical visits, day programs; transportation to educational and training facilities; medical transportation; transportation to day programs; surveillance and parameter security; maintenance of facilities; community-based program activities; serve warrants; pick up violators; incident investigations; and parole violation investigations.

Office of the Attorney General (OAG)
The mission of the OAG is to protect the safety, security, and quality of life of the people of New Jersey through an integrated and coordinated structure of law enforcement and regulatory agencies. OAG represents the public’s rights and interests in all legal matters. With ten divisions, as well as independent commissions and boards, OAG has wide-ranging responsibilities critical to the people of New Jersey. The Attorney General, as head of the Department of Law and Public Safety, serves as the state’s chief law enforcement officer and legal advisor, and is also responsible for the management and administration of the Department.

Vehicles for OAG are used by investigators conducting mission critical projects for the Attorney General; investigators for EEO; and State Police monitoring of the Consent Decree.

Division of Highway Traffic Safety (HTS)
The mission of the HTS is to reduce fatalities, injuries and property damage on the roads of New Jersey resulting from traffic crashes. To achieve its mission, the HTS undertakes traffic safety programs relating to Education, Enforcement, and Engineering.

Vehicles are used to conduct surveillance; training; traffic safety programs; educational safety testing and planning; on the road enforcement and traffic checks; community-based programs; and public outreach.

Racing Commission
The New Jersey Racing Commission is responsible for regulating the safety and integrity of the horse racing industry through the conduct of investigations, prosecutions and via regular monitoring.
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Vehicles are used by investigators, veterinarians, technicians and other professionals for licensing, fingerprinting, photographing, and screening all personnel working for or connected with track operations; transportation of blood specimens for chemical analysis; conduct hearings and appeals resulting from disciplinary actions; and oversight of casino simulcasting of racing events.

Division of Law (DOL)
The legal representation of 16 departments and over 400 agencies of State government is the obligation of the DOL; and it is through this Division that the Attorney General performs most duties relating to her statutory role as chief counsel for the State, responsible for enforcement of public duties and responsibilities and protection of the public interest.

Vehicles are used by the DOL for legal, administrative and law enforcement purposes. DOL attorneys must appear in court houses throughout the State.

Gaming Enforcement (DGE)
The Division of Gaming Enforcement’s mission is to protect the public interest by maintaining a legitimate and viable industry, free from the influences of organized crime and assuring the honesty, good character and integrity of casino owners and operators.

Vehicles are used for oversight by the DGE including investigations, inspections, audits, surveillance, arrest, and criminal and regulatory prosecutions.

EZ Pass
Each Division provides monthly mileage reports to the Central Motor Pool within the Department of Treasury. EZ pass statements are reviewed and monitored by each Division for compliance. The Divisions receive monthly statements.

State Police
The FY 2010 Budget Recommendation includes funding to make vehicle purchases not to exceed a total purchase price of $12.8 million. Depending on the operational needs of the Division, such funding will allow the DSP to purchase a combination of both marked and unmarked troop vehicles which will ultimately result in an annual line of credit payment of approximately $3.5 million.

These new vehicles will be used to replace high mileage units. As such, the fleet will not be expanded.

All marked vehicles are 100% consent decree compliant. All Crown Victorias, Impalas and many Chrysler products are “E85” compliant, meaning they are alternate fuel vehicles. These products comprise the majority of the State Police fleet.

As far as criteria for fuel efficiency, the smaller more fuel efficient “police package” vehicle (Impala) is purchased when the size and trunk storage space is not an issue.

Approximately $4,447,817 in funding will be needed in FY 2011 for all line of credit payments on vehicles acquired prior to FY 2010.
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5. P.L. 2005, c. 311, approved in January 2006, increased motor vehicle registration surcharges by $3.00, from $1.00 to $4.00. Under this enactment, surcharge revenue dedicated to the New Jersey Medical Service Helicopter Response Program Fund increased from $1.00 to $3.00, and the additional $1.00 surcharge was dedicated to funding new State Police trooper classes. At the time of enactment, the revenue from each $1.00 surcharge was estimated to generate approximately $7 million annually.

According to the Governor's FY 2010 budget, total surcharge revenues for the purchase and maintenance of law enforcement and Medevac helicopters are projected to total $26,867 million in FY 2009 and $28,382 million in FY 2010 (pages C-14, C-15 and C-16). The Governor's recommended 2010 budget does not appear to provide for an additional State Police recruit class.

As of March 2008, the Department of Law and Public Safety had advertised a Request for Proposal (RFP) to purchase three to five new helicopters to replace an aging air ambulance and law enforcement fleet. In 2007, the fleet of nine helicopters was grounded on average 126 days per craft.

- **Question:** What is the department’s spending plan for the New Jersey Emergency Medical Service Helicopter Response Program Fund in both FY 2009 and FY 2010? Please provide an update of the State's helicopter fleet purchases. Please include the number of days in FY 2008, and thus far in FY 2009, each aircraft in the fleet was grounded for maintenance and repair. What is the estimated annual cost of fleet maintenance for FY 2008 and FY 2009? Please provide the average cost per flight.

- **Question:** What is the department's FY 2010 spending plan for new State Police recruit classes? Please provide an assessment of the State Police total force strength if no new recruit classes are conducted in FY 2010. Will the Division of State Police be able to meet its force strength goals? Please provide a statistical breakdown by gender and ethnicity of the FY 2008 and FY 2009 trooper recruit classes.

**Helicopter**

The Department is in the process of purchasing five (5) helicopters. Department personnel are working in conjunction with staff members within the Division of Purchase and Property to finalize the Best and Final Offer process with regards to this procurement. It is anticipated that a contract with the vendor will be executed by June 1, 2009.

The spending plan for New Jersey's Emergency Medical Service Helicopter Response Program in FY 2009 totals $9.96 million including: $5.5 million for operating costs (salaries, training, and fuel), $2.16 million for the line of credit payment on the used helicopter, as well as $2.3 million for helicopter maintenance. In FY 2010, the program's spending plan of $13.6 million includes: $6.06 million for operating costs (salaries, training, and fuel), $5.3 million for the line of credit payment for new helicopters, as well as an estimated $2.27 million in maintenance costs. The delivery and acceptance of new helicopters will ultimately reduce the maintenance costs substantially.

In FY 2008, the helicopters in the Aviation Bureau fleet were grounded an average of 71 days per aircraft, due to maintenance and repair. In the first nine months of FY 2009, the helicopters
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have been grounded an average of 78 days per helicopter. The annual maintenance cost in FY 2008 for the fleet was $3 million and maintenance costs are estimated at $2.3 million for FY 2009. The average cost per flight is estimated at $2,500.

Recruit Classes
In the FY 2010 Governor’s Budget Recommendation, there are no funds provided for new recruit training classes. The Department of Law and Public Safety is applying on behalf of the Division of State Police for federal stimulus funding to hire troopers. This program, known as the Cops Hiring Recovery Program (CHR), will support, if our application is accepted, the hiring of approximately 150 state troopers will help address attrition. The grant will support the salaries and benefits of these troopers for three years. Once these troopers enter their fourth year of service, the program requires that the State support their salaries with Direct State Services for one year.

If the application is accepted, the Department will explore whether there are other federal grants that can be used to support the training costs, otherwise the State funding would have to be restored in the budget of approximately $4.7 million to $5 million.

It is projected that the Division of State Police’s enlisted staffing level will rise to approximately 3,075 by July 1, 2009, with the graduation of the 150th recruit classes in June of 2009. If there are no recruit classes in FY 2010 and if attrition levels remain constant with projected FY 2009 levels, the level may drop to approximately 2,975 by July 1, 2010.

The following chart represents a statistical breakdown by gender and ethnicity of the recruits invited to and completed training within the 148th and 149th classes which graduated in June of 2008, as well as the statistics, to date, for the recruits within the 150th class which is due to graduate on June 26, 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Invited to Training</th>
<th>Graduated Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>260 (71.2%)</td>
<td>209 (75.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>13 (3.5%)</td>
<td>6 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>17 (4.6%)</td>
<td>9 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>0 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>61 (16.7%)</td>
<td>43 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>9 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Male</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Female</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365 (100%)</td>
<td>276 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department has established a partnership with the National Guard to expand recruiting initiatives.

6a. According to the Administrative Office of the Courts, in 2007 there were 24,911 drunk driving convictions in this State, including first, second, and third time offenses, down from 25,296 in 2006. Hoping to further curtail drunk driving, the New Jersey Division of Alcoholic
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Beverage Control (ABC) established a Statewide database in 2007 containing information on where drunk drivers consumed their last drink. The purpose of the database is to identify licensed liquor establishments that have been repeatedly named so that investigators can determine whether violations are taking place in those establishments.

- **Question:** Please provide information on this database, including the start-up and ongoing maintenance expenditures. Please describe how ABC is using the information gathered in the database to track offending licensed liquor establishments. How many businesses were fined as the result of the information gathered?

Implemented in September 2007, the Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control’s (ABC) Last Drink Initiative, and corresponding Attorney General’s directive, requires that law enforcement officers ask all individuals arrested for drunk driving where they had been drinking. If the individual provides the name of a licensed establishment, that information is forwarded to the ABC, where it is entered into a database and used as an investigative tool to help establish trends and patterns that may point to a potential problem at a licensed bar or restaurant. In 2008, the ABC Investigations Bureau received a total of 4,665 reports from New Jersey law enforcement agencies. Of the 7,883 total consumption licenses, only 1,930 were named in the reports, or 24.4 percent of the total.

The data collected from the Last Drink Initiative provides a tool to focus on where and when to deploy the Bureau’s staff. The data is not used as a basis to bring administrative charges against a licensee. Rather, the data is used to identify licensees that may have a business operation that encourages over-consumption of alcoholic beverages by its patrons. Investigative staff is then deployed to observe if administrative violations are occurring. Administrative charges are then brought based upon the investigative staff.

Using the information provided, the Bureau initiated several investigations of the business practices of those establishments listed in the top frequency of reports. The number one licensed premise was reported a total of forty times by nine different police departments - a frequency 14.8 times higher than the median.

An additional benefit from the program has been the data’s value in assisting in the ABC’s enforcement efforts to combat underage consumption of alcoholic beverages. Since the data collected lists the age of the intoxicated driver, the ABC is able to query a listing of licensed establishments where underage patrons were consuming alcohol prior to their arrest. This data is helpful in deploying staff to observe patron activity inside licensed establishment and “card” suspected underage patrons who were observed purchasing and/or consuming alcoholic beverages. For the first three months of 2009, the arrests for the sale, service and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages by a person under the legal age are 76 percent higher than the same period in 2008. Use of the Last Drink Initiative data is a factor in this increase.


- **Question:** How many, if any, applications been submitted to the division for the special licenses? How many, if any, special licenses have been issued under this statute? What has been the fiscal impact to the ABC division?
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There have been no applications submitted under this statute to ABC. Current feedback indicates that the statute is of limited application and of limited viability in attracting business enterprises. As a result, there has been no cost to the ABC.

7. New Jersey enacted P.L.2003, c.183, to expand the crimes for which DNA is collected under the DNA Database and Databank Act of 1994.

- **Question:** Has the backlog of unanalyzed cases stabilized as a result of P.L.2003, c.183? What steps, such as contracting out cases, have been taken to eliminate the backlog? What legal ramifications, if any, are caused by this backlog? What staffing changes need to be made, if any, to keep up with DNA processing? For each year since enactment, please indicate the average number of days required to process a DNA sample. Are there any specific areas, such as juvenile crime, that require a more expedited DNA process?

The Office of Forensic Sciences currently has no backlog of convicted offender samples to be analyzed; however, there is a backlog of 720 Forensic Biology cases, which are cases that involve the analysis of DNA evidence collected from crime scenes. The caseload has increased 300% over the last five.

The lab is making some progress in the forensic case backlog due to an overtime program being funded by a federal grant from the National Institute of Justice. There are over 2,800 hits to the DNA database; cases that would not have been solved without this state of the art DNA technology. The caseload continues to increase due to the success of the DNA program.

Currently, the lab does not outsource any work to private vendors. All work is done in-house. Historically, the Office of Forensic Sciences has found that outsourcing of casework does not provide the intended relief in the backlog due to the efforts and expense associated with shipping and receiving cases, as well as the extensive review of data from the outsourced vendor. Work performed at an outsourced lab may not be able to be uploaded to the CODIS database. The lab can perform this work much quicker and less expensively.

The average number of days for turning around a forensic biology case over the last five years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cases that have a juvenile defendant are always expedited. In addition, there are many instances when the forensic biology program is tasked with expediting an analysis. This could be for a number of reasons, but typically the agency is counting on a forensic DNA profile being generated from the evidence that hits with a convicted offender in the database. This information may provide a valuable investigative lead in solving the crime. Many times the lab
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is also requested to expedite a case for a pending trial date. It is very common for the prosecutor’s office to make last minute requests for additional testing prior to the start of a major trial.

8. In FY 2007, the Department of Corrections received $8 million to replace the high temperature hot water underground distribution system at South Woods State Prison which was installed ten years ago. The Department of Corrections received another $6 million in FY 2008 to continue repairs. As of May 2008, the Office of the Attorney General, in conjunction with the Treasury, was pursuing litigation to recover damages as a result of this system failure.

- **Question:** Please provide an update on this litigation.

State of New Jersey v. Perini Corporation, et al., Docket No. MER-L-1144-08 - The Southwoods State Prison, a design-build construction project completed in 1999, has experienced repeated failures of the high temperature hot water (HTHW) distribution system which serves the Prison. Leaks in the system began in 2000 and have increased in severity and duration over the years, to the point where Corrections personnel became concerned about the prospect of a failure which might require shutdown of the institution and the transfer of the inmate population to other correctional facilities.

In April 2008, the State filed suit against Perini Corporation (the design-build contractor on the project) and its sureties, L. Robert Kimball & Associates (the architectural and engineering firm that designed the project), Natkin & Company (the mechanical subcontractor), Perma-Pipe, Inc. (the pipe manufacturer) and Jacobs Facilities, Inc. (the State’s construction management firm) to recover the cost of replacing the HTHW system, currently estimated at more than $20 million. An initial case management conference with the court was held on January 27, 2009. The court set a deadline of May 27, 2009 for completion of paper discovery, i.e., interrogatories and production of documents, with a second case management conference scheduled for April 27, 2009. Discovery is continuing, and it is anticipated that the case will be ongoing for sometime.

9. The New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs’ mission is to protect New Jersey citizens from consumer fraud and ensure consumers are educated about their rights. The division supervises the activities of 43 boards and committees, regulating more than 80 professions and occupations. Approximately 600,000 New Jerseyans are licensed by these boards or committees.

Currently, legislation is pending which would require the Division of Consumer Affairs to: license fitness professionals (A3356/S2164), genetic counselors (A269/ S1226), barbering (A3181/S1240), dietitians and nutritionists (A2933/S1941); register chimney sweeps (S352) and jewelers (A3337); establish a three-year Nurse Educator Pilot Program (A207); develop an informational brochure regarding dental amalgam (A2925); provide photographic identification cards issued for certain health care professionals (A321); establish a New Jersey Athlete Agent Regulatory Board (A1624); and create a directory of telemarketers (A1812) just to cite a few potential new duties. According to the evaluation data included in the Governor's FY 2010 Budget (page D-278), the number of Consumer Affairs positions has gone from 445 (actual) to 366. Similarly, staff supporting Operation of State Professional Boards for FY 2007 was 245 positions (actual) whereas in FY 2010 the number of positions budgeted for this purpose is 210.
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- **Question:** How is staffing allocated among boards within the division? How has the reduction in staffing affected the boards and other division responsibilities? What strategies has this division employed to cope with staff reductions? What projects, work products or functions has the division discontinued or deferred because of decreased staffing levels? How does the division plan to manage its responsibilities given that regulated professions are constantly changing and evolving? Is there a minimum cost to the division to newly license and regulate a profession, regardless of the number of licensees? Please elaborate on cost components. Does the division foresee that any currently licensed profession will require less oversight than was necessary in previous years? Are the fees collected by each board sufficient to cover the cost for each respective license area? If not, please explain.

The division is pursuing an internal reorganization of the Boards to gain further economies of scale. Centralization of common functions and further clustering of boards are major features of the reorganization plan. Under the reorganization plan, the division will propose to consolidate the organization of professional boards to maximize staff and resources. In addition, the Division is proposing a moratorium on the establishment of additional boards, committees and advisory councils within the Division. The moratorium would continue until such time as a mechanism is put in place to evaluate the necessity of proposed boards and their contribution to the health, safety and welfare of consumers, as well as whether the Department has sufficient resources to handle additional responsibilities.

The Boards are, for the most part, organized into units, or “clusters”. By clustering groups of boards together into units, valuable resources are shared and the Division maximizes economies of scale. Those Boards with a large numbers of licensees, for example the Boards of Nursing, Medical Examiners, Pharmacy and Cosmetology/Hairstyling, are not grouped (clustered) with other Boards.

The Division is committed to continue licensing and regulating its more than 600,000 licensees in the manner prescribed by statute, despite the reductions in staff.

The use of technology has been a successful strategy to cope with the staff reductions. Ninety percent (90%) of individuals who hold licenses, registrations or certificates issued by the Division are renewing them online. Plans are underway to develop and deploy an online initial application process. This effort will allow the Division to reallocate personnel resources to critically understaffed areas. Another area where technology is being employed to realize efficiencies in light of fewer staff is the Internet. Board disciplinary orders, applications, notices, minutes, agendas and other types of important information are now available on the Web. This initiative has increased staff availability to handle critical core functions, reduced incoming telephone calls and reduced mailing costs.

Waiting times to speak with Division representatives have increased for licensees and consumers; however, the Division continues to address this problem through the increased use of technology and through centralization of the phone answering functions.

There are base costs which are not affected by the number of individuals to be licensed. These costs include the salary and fringe benefits of board staff (executive director and clerical support) as well as the costs to run a board office including but not limited to: materials and
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supplies; services; maintenance and fixed charges; legal support, enforcement support and administrative support.

It should also be noted that boards incur costs long before they take in revenues. The process of formulating and adopting regulations takes at least two years – a period within which the board is incurring staffing and legal costs as well as other administrative expenses.

There are no professions that will require less oversight under the present legislative and regulatory framework.

The fees collected by each board are sufficient to cover the cost for each respective license area. In the event that expenses exceed revenues, a fee increase will be adopted via regulation.

10. The FY 2010 budget appropriates $1.9 million for the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) in the Juvenile Justice Commission, a reduction of $2.1 million over the actual FY 2008 and adjusted FY 2009 appropriation levels. According to the FY 2008 Budget in Brief, the goals of the initiative were to continue to reduce the number of youth held in secure detention without diminishing public safety; and to improve conditions in secure detention for those youth requiring that level of supervision. Strategies to be employed to accomplish these goals included: effective admission policies; enhancement of alternatives to secure detention; reduction of racial disparities in secure detention; and reduction in case processing delays.

As of 2008, the JDAI programs were in place in 10 counties (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Hudson, Monmouth, Bergen, Burlington, Mercer, Ocean, and Union).

*Question:* With a recommended FY 2010 decrease of $2.1 million in State funding for JDAI, to which additional counties, if any, will JDAI be extended in FY 2010, and on what basis were these counties chosen? Are any additional county-source funds required as a condition of State JDAI funding, and if so, what is the match ratio? If expansion of JDAI occurs as planned, what State funding would be required in FY 2011 to sustain the initiative in all participating counties? How much State funding would be necessary to extend the program to every county in New Jersey on an annual basis? What is the average daily and annual population in each JDAI site? What is the current daily and annual cost per child in each facility compared to a child in a secure site?

In 2008 all non-JDAI counties were invited to send a team of three individuals to the 4th Annual NJ JDAI All-Sites Conference to learn about the initiative. These counties were encouraged to contact the Commission following the conference if they were interested in and committed to becoming a JDAI site. As a result, in March 2009, Somerset County was officially launched as the eleventh NJ-JDAI site. Additionally, Passaic County has submitted a Letter of Interest and JDAI Site-Readiness Application, currently under review. Middlesex County has requested the JDAI application, which the Commission has provided, and Gloucester County has sent correspondence expressing their desire to apply. Several other counties have expressed potential interest in being "next in line." However, the ability to accept applications from the 10 non-JDAI counties is dependent on available resources, and effective resource allocation.
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There is no county match ratio, rather counties must examine existing resources, and reallocate or otherwise “leverage” existing funds to support detention system reform. The established JDAI sites have successfully reallocated existing resources to more effectively support the local detention/justice system; NJ-JDAI anticipates that each new site will be as successful. Leveraged funds are dollars reallocated to support reform work, policy, practice, and programming.

As of the close of calendar year 2008, 10 sites had been participating in NJ-JDAI. Average daily population in those sites for the year prior to JDAI participation, compared to 2008, appears below. For the original five JDAI sites, the pre-JDAI year is 2003, and for the five phase two sites, it is 2005. These figures are just one measure of the remarkable changes achieved in JDAI sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-JDAI</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Change Kids</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>243.6</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>-129</td>
<td>-52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Sites SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>499.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>277.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>-221</strong></td>
<td><strong>-44.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 Sites SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>163.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>126.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>-37</strong></td>
<td><strong>-22.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>662.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>404.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-258</strong></td>
<td><strong>-38.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JDAI is not a program comprised of “placements.” Rather, the JDAI is a process that follows a set of core strategies and related practices whereby the agencies and professionals who operate the detention system rely on data to conduct a continuous “system self-diagnosis.” A primary objective of that process is to hold ourselves accountable for operating the most efficient and effective juvenile justice system possible - a system that ensures youth are not inappropriately or unnecessarily detained, and that promotes positive outcomes for youth. As such, there is not a one-to-one ratio whereby a secure detention placement is substituted with an alternative placement.

However, some cost-saving calculations can be made based on the overall reduction of youth in detention as a result of JDAI. In the most recent year of JDAI (2008), across the ten JDAI sites, an average of 258 fewer youth were in detention on any given day as compared to pre-JDAI (258 X 365 days = a reduction of 94,170 child care days). At an approximate, average cost per day per youth in detention of $175, the estimated annual savings is $16,479,750 (94,170 child care days X $175 per day).
11a. In October 2007, Governor Corzine released a three part public safety strategy which addressed "... enforcement, prevention and re-entry with an emphasis on a reduction of gang violence, violent crime and recidivism."

According to the Executive’s press release the strategy included the following principles:

[First, every component will use data and analysis to both identify problems and eliminate them. Second, the state will serve in a support role to help identify problems and assist communities in applying appropriate solutions. Third, involved parties must communicate fully with one another in the development, delivery and assessment of strategies and programs. Finally, all programs will be critically evaluated through data driven analysis and adjusted appropriately to ensure maximum effectiveness. The enforcement aspect of the plan ... will target and prosecute those who engage in gang violence and carry illegal weapons.]

Specifically, the State planned to assist law enforcement agencies in implementing intelligence-led policing prevention initiatives and to require locals to submit crime data to the State in hopes to monitor overall crime trends and offenders.

- **Question:** Please provide a program update of the Governor’s public safety initiative. Please provide the spending plan for this public safety initiative. Please identify all funding to date directed toward accomplishing this initiative. What new capital funding in FY 2009, if any, was allocated to support this initiative, such as video technology? What training, if any, was provided to locals to assist in this initiative?

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**

The law enforcement component of the Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy employs intelligence-led policing strategies to target and prosecute those who pose the greatest threat to public safety: gang members and associates that commit or threaten violence with a firearm. The law enforcement component fuses together proven concepts, such as active intelligence collection and objective-driven and high-impact investigations, into a comprehensive and flexible strategy that leverages intelligence gathering and information sharing to quickly recognize commonalities and trends in crime in a given area. The objective is to be proactive in addressing violent crime instead of merely reacting to crime that has already been committed.

In March 2008, we developed and distributed to all County Prosecutors a county threat assessment instrument. The threat assessment helped identify and prioritize gang and gun-related violence problems and those responsible for the violence in a given community. The threat assessment, in conjunction with on-going intelligence analysis, serves as a "roadmap" for prioritizing State, County, and local law enforcement efforts to effectively deal with identified threats of violence using the tenets of the crime plan's investigative strategy. Counties routinely update their threat assessments and use it to guide and prioritize violence reduction efforts.
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Additionally, the Attorney General has worked with the county prosecutors to transform the counties’ narcotics task forces into multi-jurisdictional task forces focusing on gangs, guns, and narcotics. Similarly, shooting response teams are transitioning from only investigating shootings to proactively intervening before shootings occur.

Inaugural Initiative

Recognizing the urgency of the State’s gang and gun violence problem, in May 2008, the Attorney General announced the launch of the Governor’s Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy Inaugural Statewide Violent Gang Initiative. This collaborative, multi-agency initiative, led by each county by the County Prosecutor, used the new threat assessment model to identify criminally active violent gang members for inclusion in this operation. The mission was simple: employ the principal tenets of the crime plan’s investigative strategy in targeted, strategic investigations of identified criminal gangs and violent gang members.

During the Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy inaugural initiative, which was completed in November 2008, County task forces and the New Jersey State Police focused on 19 Counties and 72 towns and cities throughout New Jersey. There results were as follows:

They effected a total of 1,844 arrests for an array of violent crimes ranging from murder, attempted murder, conspiracy to commit murder, assault with a firearm, and armed robbery to drug and gun trafficking and possession. One hundred sixty-two (162) guns were removed from New Jersey communities, including 22 assault weapons. Although these operations targeted violent criminals and not just drug dealers, the operation netted a cache of drugs with a street value of $4,010,732 and $857,769 in cash.
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Governor’s Strategy for Safe Streets and Neighborhoods

Statewide Inaugural Operation Results
19 Counties - 72 Cities and Towns

ATLANTIC COUNTY
Atlantic City
Buena
Egg Harbor City
Mays Landing
Pleasantville

BERGEN COUNTY
Bergenfield
Englewood
Hackensack
BURLINGTON
Burlington
Edgewater Park
Mount Holly
Westampton
Willingboro
CAMDEN
Camden City
CAPE MAY COUNTY
Cape May
Middle Township
Wildwood

CUMBERLAND COUNTY
Bridgeton
Fairfield Township
Millville
Vineland

ESSEX COUNTY
East Orange
Irvington
Newark

GLOUCESTER COUNTY
Deerfield
Glassboro
Mays
P auditing
Woodbury
HUDSON COUNTY
Jersey City
Union City
MERCER COUNTY
Ewing
Hamilton
Trenton

MIDDLESEX COUNTY
New Brunswick
Parth Amboy
Bayonne
South Amboy
South Brunswick

MONMOUTH COUNTY
Asbury Park
Freehold Borough
Holliston
Newtown
Navesink

MORRIS COUNTY
Denville
Dover
Randolph
Rockaway
Vickery Gardens
Wharton

OCEAN COUNTY
Berkeley
Berkeley Township
Brick
Lacey
Little Egg Harbor
Beachwood
Stafford Township
South Toms River

PASSAIC COUNTY
Paterson
Wayne

SALEM COUNTY
Pitman
Quinton
Salem

SOMERSET COUNTY
Somerville

SUSSEX COUNTY
Vernon

UNION COUNTY
City of Plainfield
Elizabeth
Union Township

TOTAL: 72
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More importantly, the State recognized its first consecutive year reduction in homicides since 1999. In 2007, there was an 11% reduction and in 2008, there was a 3% reduction in homicides.

Camden Initiative

Moreover, the Attorney General’s Office and the Camden Police Department launched a strategic initiative to reduce gang-related gun violence in the city, targeting those individuals and criminal gangs who commit or are likely to commit acts of violence in Camden.

Restructuring the agency in July 2008, it now dedicates its resources to violence reduction by increasing the number of personnel performing enforcement and field investigation duties by nearly 300%. The Department is now capable of focusing police resources on multiple violent crime “hot spots” while not diluting the strength of neighborhood patrol. A Command and Coordination Center operates on a round-the-clock basis for coordinating anti-crime and violence efforts through deployment to hot spots, among other strategies.

To deal with an escalating drug war that was reportedly responsible for a 108% increase in homicides during the first five months of 2008, an investigative taskforce initiative was launched during early summer. Between June and October 2008 (task force operational period), the violence momentum slowed considerably and Camden experienced a reduction in homicides during this period as compared to both the first five months of 2008 and same time period the prior year. Specifically, homicides decreased by 9% during the five months of task force operations as compared to a 108% increase during the previous five months of 2008. This is a significant accomplishment in and of itself, but more so because the decrease occurred during the summer months when homicides tend to increase and in the midst of a drug war. Reductions in homicides and shootings continue in 2009 with homicide down by 56% and firearm assaults down by 43%.

Phase II

Phase II of the initiative was launched in January 2009. It builds on the foundation established and successes realized in Phase I. In order to fully leverage the benefits of the Governor’s Crime Plan and ensure the greatest results and impact, in addition to the 21 counties, 21 cities
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are participating in Phase II of the initiative. Specifically, there are monthly regional meetings in which cities and counties can partner, strategize and formulate ideas to dismantle gangs and reduce violence.

Phase II takes a more holistic approach by not only including cities but also holding Gangstat sessions. Gangstat sessions, including both cities and counties, serve as a platform for sharing gang-related information and shaping violent gang investigative outcomes consistent with the initiative. New Jersey is probably the first state to launch such an ambitious, widespread, and coordinated approach to dealing with gang violence.

Additionally, during Phase II, an initiative in Irvington is being launched. With 24 murder victims in 2008, Irvington Township experienced the 4th highest number of homicides in the State. Consequently, local, county, and State law enforcement agencies have worked collaboratively to build strong partnerships and the necessary foundation to enable the successful launch of a combined law enforcement investigative task force to target several high priority gang members believed to be responsible for fueling much of the Township’s gang-related violent crime; reduce the instances of gun and other forms of violence; and make Irvington streets safer for its citizens.

Technology

Recognizing that some local police agencies lack the technical resources and expertise necessary to support intelligence-led policing strategies, the Attorney General has worked with several municipalities and funding entities to assist the municipalities in securing funding. In partnership with the Department of Community Affairs and the Urban Enterprise Zone Authority, OAG is reviewing proposals by municipalities to use UEZ funds for law enforcement technology programs to ensure that the allocation of State funds supports the transition of New Jersey law enforcement agencies to proactive, intelligence-led policing. OAG is currently working with numerous municipal law enforcement agencies and municipalities in refining their proposed public safety video surveillance projects to ensure that the expenditure of public dollars realizes maximum public safety benefits. Training has been ongoing within the State Police, and we are in the process of designing a Statewide training program. Additionally, Crimetrac, a shooting and gang-incident reporting system available to law enforcement agencies across the State, has been developed by the New Jersey State Police and is another tool to utilize in aggressively pursuing identified violent, drug gang members.

We are also implementing numerous systems to improve the timeliness and completeness of intelligence and incidence data available to State, county, and local law enforcement agencies. In addition to the Crimetrac system, for the first time, all law enforcement agencies are now submitting their Uniform Crime Reporting statistics to the State Police electronically. Electronic submission significantly reduces both the burden and delay of reporting and identifying crime trends.

New York/New Jersey High Intensity Drug Trafficking

Over the past year, the Attorney General’s office has worked closely with Mercer and Middlesex counties on their petitions for inclusion into the New York/New Jersey High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (NY/NJ HIDTA). Currently, the NY/NJ HIDTA region encompasses New
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York City and several counties located throughout New York as well as the northeastern New Jersey counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Passaic, and Union.

The mission of the NY/NJ HIDTA is to build partnerships to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking organizations ("DTOs") through collaborative, measurable initiatives including enforcement, information sharing, training and prevention. The NY/NJ HIDTA is led by an Executive Board consisting of 24 federal, state and local law enforcement leaders in NY and NJ, including the New Jersey Attorney General, and consists of over 1000 federal, state and local law enforcement officers from over 100 agencies in this region.

Located on the I-95 corridor, Mercer and Middlesex counties occupy critical positions on the pipelines of criminal drug trafficking networks operating in New Jersey, New York, and elsewhere. These counties also report high levels of violent crime, gang activity, and narcotics trafficking. The expansion of the NY/NJ HIDTA to include Mercer and Middlesex counties will enhance law enforcement's ability to combat violent drug traffickers statewide and regionally by increasing coordination of resources, technology, and information. Mercer and Middlesex counties' petitions for inclusion in the NY/NJ HIDTA are currently pending with the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP).

PREVENTION

The Prevention component of the Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy encompasses a bold and comprehensive approach that represents the cutting edge of "prevention" efforts across the nation. It reflects the recognition that because there are multiple and interrelated factors contributing to juvenile delinquency, gangs, and youth violence, there must be multiple and interrelated solutions to preventing them.

The four overarching goals as we implement the Prevention Strategy are as follows: (1) Improve the coordination of Prevention-related resources and efforts across State departments and agencies; (2) Implement specific strategies and programs to improve the number of young people who we "Keep in School and Positively Engaged"; (3) Empower communities to improve coordination of their respective Prevention-related resources and efforts; and (4) Improve accountability and outcomes for all State-funded Prevention programs and initiatives.

Coordination of Resources

In working to improve the coordination of Prevention-related resources and efforts, we convened the Prevention Coordinating Council in June 2008. This Council consists of senior-level representatives from all relevant departments and agencies as well as several non-governmental representatives from statewide prevention and youth development organizations. The Council meets regularly and also includes four sub-committees focused on coordination of resources, effective programs and accountability, community empowerment, and communications.

The coordination of resources committee engaged in a process to develop a formal interdepartmental Coordinated Resources Management Committee. The framework for this Coordinated Resources Management Committee was developed with input from several departments and its first meeting is scheduled for this May. This Committee consists of key
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designees from each department and agency, it is scheduled to meet bi-monthly, and it is charged with ensuring the effective coordination of several hundred million dollars in “prevention” funding across departments and agencies. The emphasis is on “coordination” and ensuring that decisions about related funding are not being made by each department in a vacuum, but rather that opportunities are maximized to leverage, partner, and coordinate programs and funding. So, to illustrate one of many possible examples, it makes sense that AmeriCorps programs in the Department of State, School Based Youth Services Programs in the Department of Children & Families, 21st Century Community Learning Center afterschool programs in the Department of Education, and Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach programs in the Department of Law & Public Safety, at a minimum, should be aware of each other’s respective efforts and, at best, actually coordinate to achieve leveraged results. This coordination of resources across departments will lead to increased efficiency and better outcomes.

Keeping Kids in School and Positively Engaged

Our Prevention Strategy, working in concert with the Prevention Coordinating Council, has identified “Keeping Kids in School and Positively Engaged” as the shared objective and organizing principle for our collective work. The link between out of school youth and juvenile arrests & gang involvement is very strong. Accordingly, our specific Prevention programs and initiatives are centered on achieving outcomes in support of this objective. In addition to many of the programs already being funded by other departments and agencies, the Department of Law & Public Safety has several initiatives underway.

In the coming months we will be unveiling plans to provide support for non-profit youth serving agencies that demonstrate a commitment to serving out-of-school and gang at-risk youth between the ages of 16 and 24. YouthBuild and Civic Justice Corps are examples of two comprehensive evidence-based program models that we know are effective. For instance, YouthBuild is an evidence-based model with a compelling track-record of success in positively engaging at-risk young people while deterring them from gangs and prison, and dramatically reducing rates of recidivism. As a comprehensive youth development, education, and workforce program model, YouthBuild is one of the most effective gang prevention tools in the nation.

Through our Prevention Strategy efforts, we are serving as the lead convener for the New Jersey High School Graduation Campaign. Working in close partnership with the Departments of Education and State, along with a rapidly growing number of governmental, community, education, business, and other coalition partners, we are in the midst of a year-long Campaign designed to raise awareness and develop concrete strategies for addressing the high school dropout crisis. This effort is aligned with, and a part of, General Colin Powell’s and the America’s Promise Alliance’s campaign to make dropout prevention a national priority and to support dropout prevention campaigns in all 50 states. Our kick-off event this past October in Newark drew more than 750 participants and was attended by Governor Corzine, Attorney General Milgram, Commissioner Davy, Secretary Wells, and many other state and local leaders. Mrs. Alma Powell, Chair of the America’s Promise Alliance, served as one of the keynote speakers. Regional Campaigns, town hall meetings, and several other information-gathering efforts are currently underway as the statewide coalition continues to grow. The first year of
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this Campaign will culminate in the fall of 2009 with a major statewide summit during which specific strategies and recommendations will be reported.

Our Department is also making resources available to support evidence-based gang and truancy prevention programs across the state. For instance, this spring our Division of Criminal Justice will be awarding grants as part of its Neighborhood Crime Prevention Initiative. This effort will support evidence-based gang and truancy prevention programs that have been developed through coordinated partnerships between proven non-profit youth-serving agencies working closely with local police departments.

Empowering Communities

Recognizing the importance of supporting communities to empower themselves to more effectively address prevention-related issues, there are several initiatives currently underway or being developed. Of particular note is our Truancy Prevention Planning Initiative. Working in partnership with the Departments of Education, State, and Children & Families, the Juvenile Justice Commission, and the Administrative Office of the Courts, we have led efforts to develop a model truancy prevention planning program in several cities. Through funding from the Department of Education, the National Center for School Engagement (NCSE) has been engaged to provide technical assistance and support to planning teams in the cities of Vineland, Camden, Asbury Park, Trenton, Newark, and Paterson. The school districts in each city are leading these planning teams and working in close partnership with key governmental, court, and community partners to address and improve policy, practice and programs related to how schools are keeping their students positively engaged. This planning process got underway in January 2009 and is expected to lead to measurable improvements in truancy and attendance rates in each of these school districts. Significantly, the work from these districts will enable NCSE and our statewide partners to develop a model toolkit for truancy prevention planning which is expected to be made available to all school districts by the end of 2009.

Accountability & Outcomes

As we strive to promote accountability and improve outcomes for the Department of Law & Public Safety's prevention-related programs as well as prevention programs across all state departments, there are several efforts underway. In October 2008, we partnered with the Association of County Youth Services Administrators to convene Blueprints for Safe Schools and Streets: The Governor's Best Practices Prevention Conference. This very successful conference highlighted close to twenty national models for evidence- and research-based prevention programs. Attended by more than 700 participants from a diverse range of stakeholder groups, this two-day conference underscored the importance of identifying and funding programs with a proven track-record of success, as demonstrated by evaluation.

As mentioned previously, the Prevention Coordinating Council and soon-to-be-launched Coordinated Resources Management Committee also serve as venues to promote accountability and evaluation as well as the development of some critical shared outcomes across departments. We are also in the process of developing a Best Practices Funding Guide. Similarly, the effective practices and accountability committee of the Prevention Coordinating Council has been charged with developing Best Practice and accountability standards for specific target areas, such as youth development programs for 16 to 24 year olds.
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Finally, it is important to note that the Urban Institute was awarded the contract to conduct the independent evaluation for all three components of the Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy and, as part of their work, will be included an evaluation of current evidence-based prevention programs across four or five State departments.

REENTRY

The reentry component of the Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy is designed to reduce recidivism and enhance public safety by: (1) launching the Another Chance Demonstration Project to provide focused programming and services to more than 1,300 offenders; (2) increasing support opportunities for youth returning home from the Juvenile Justice Commission; and (3) addressing the needs of reentering ex-offenders through system wide changes to reduce barriers to integration. Over this past year, the State has made significant strides in meeting these objectives and building infrastructure to sustain change.

A comparison of the Another Chance cohort that was on parole at the beginning of this project with a similarly situated group of parolees indicates that Another Chance parolees have a 26% lower re-arrest rate than similar parolees not involved in Another Chance. As other cohorts, who are receiving both pre- and post-release services are introduced back into their communities, we expect to see continued decreases in recidivism rates among the Another Chance participants.

Statewide Director Wanda Moore has convened a Reentry Coordinating Council that will assist her in achieving the goals articulated in the Safe Streets & Neighborhoods Strategy and provide advice, counsel and recommendations regarding a range of policy areas associated with reentry, including, health care, substance abuse, housing, legislation and policy, and other issues involving the ex-offender population.

Another Chance remains the cornerstone of the reentry strategy. The roughly 1,300 inmates and ex-offenders who make up the cohort groups receive a battery of reentry-related services and programs aimed at reducing recidivism. Our three main partner agencies, Corrections (DOC), Parole (SPB), and Labor & Workforce Development (LWD) have implemented several procedures to improve communication among themselves and to the participants in Another Chance. Both DOC and SPB have created a referral system for max-outs and parolees to visit and be registered at Labor One-Stop Career Centers. These referrals ensure that Another Chance participants are helped by dedicated reentry-trained personnel at the local One-Stop Career Center who then provide a referral to a job coach. As noted in our 2008 comments, job coach funding was redirected and made available for the reentry component of the public safety plan by the Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

In addition, our office, in collaboration with DOC, SPB and LWD, has created a database managed by DOC that captures individual-level data about every member of Another Chance. This system not only allows us to measure performance benchmarks established by the reentry team, but pinpoints particular services that are contributing to positive (and negative) outcomes. Monthly reporting from that database is provided to our office. Further, through a $192,000 grant provided by The Nicholson Foundation, and with the support of the New Jersey Office of Information Technology (OIT), a second data warehouse is being constructed that will facilitate the collation of data from multiple agencies for the purpose of evaluating the Another Chance
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Demonstration Project and, at the agencies' discretion, serve as a warehouse for other criminal justice related information. Existing personnel at DOC, SPB, LWD and OIT are supporting this project, while funding from The Nicholson Foundation will allow OIT to hire several consultants to assist in the creation of the data warehouse.

Notable legislative achievements include the passage of legislation permitting the performance of “reformative service” such as vocational training, education, counseling, and community service in lieu of paying Drug Enforcement Demand Reduction (DEDR) monetary penalties, legislation that gives judges discretion, in certain cases, to lower mandatory DEDR penalties, and legislation permitting driver’s license restoration in compelling circumstances to drug offenders whose charges are conditionally discharged.

The Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) continues to operate transitional facilities in Mercer, Camden and Essex Counties. These facilities match adolescents with counselors and other community resources to assist with substance abuse treatment, technical training and education. Since inception, a total of 308 parolees and 99 probationers have been served. JJC has also developed an educational incentive program using No Child Left Behind Funds to provide juveniles in JJC custody the opportunity to take college or career and technical education courses. Thus far, dozens of inmates have either registered for, or taken courses at, Burlington County Institute of Technology, Passaic County Technical Institute, Middlesex County College, Middlesex County College Career Training Center, and Warren County Community College.

Further, JJC, through its MOU with the Motor Vehicle Commission (MVC) has provided 185 committed juveniles with an MVC-approved identification card. JJC continues to expand video-teleconferencing, which is now accessible at 50 points of connectivity and allows staff to reduce time driving to meetings, driving residents to court, and allows for remote family visitation. Lastly, JJC's Next Step Discharge Center is fully operational at the New Jersey Training School and has provided 89 youth with individualized reentry case planning since its launch in July 2008.

Public policy initiatives have either launched or expanded in the past year focusing on the inmate and ex-offender population. DOC formed a fatherhood program to help male inmates increase their ability to become self-sufficient, support their children and become better fathers. DOC also expanded literacy programs for inmates returning to Passaic, Essex, Mercer and Camden Counties. DOC launched the Reentry Pre-Qualification and Referrals for Ex-Offenders (PREPARE) program in Union and Passaic Counties. PREPARE uses social workers as liaisons between soon-to-be released inmates, the Department of Human Services and the Department of Veteran's Affairs to assist offenders in pre-qualifying for public benefits.

Our State Parole Board is using Residential Assessment Centers (RACs) to provide individualized assessments of the risks and needs of parole violators so that informed decisions can be made about whether to return the parolee to prison on a parole violation in the hopes of lowering technical parole violations that result in re-incarceration. In 2008, SPB's Female Offender Reentry Group (FORGE) assisted 572 female ex-offenders in receiving job training, education and obtaining legal identification. In the coming year, FORGE will expand to Mercer and Camden Counties with the expectation of serving an additional 230 female parolees a year.
Lastly, Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI) grants from the federal government have been provided to Trenton and Newark. In Newark, the state is assisting the city in implementing a reentry program that includes grant money from the U.S. Department of Labor, foundations and matching state contributions. Newark PRI will serve 1,350 ex-offenders returning to Newark over a two-year period. In Trenton, SPB will manage a federal grant to work with the city in creating a reentry program for inmates returning to Trenton.

11b. Gun reduction strategies are part of the Governor’s public safety initiative. To achieve this goal, response teams were established to investigate shootings quickly and strategies were devised to increase coordination with the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms national eTrace database to more effectively trace the sources of illegal firearms.

- **Question:** How many guns have been tested and entered into the eTrace database? How many of the tested guns have resulted in a criminal arrest? Which communities, if any, are not participating in this program to date? If there are communities that are not participating in the program, please explain why you think these communities are choosing not to participate.

The NJ Trace system was implemented on April 1, 2008, and 4,922 New Jersey firearms traces were conducted in calendar year 2008. Firearms are not tested by NJ Trace. NJ Trace provides NJ law enforcement personnel an electronic gateway to the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosive’s (ATF) e-Trace database, which can disclose the identity of a firearm’s first purchaser, when it was purchased and where it was purchased. Once traces are processed, analysts positioned at the newly created NJ Crime Gun Center, housed at the Regional Operations Information Center (ROIC), are able to produce intelligence and develop investigative leads for investigators. As of this writing, twelve individuals are currently facing indictment for illegal weapon transfer charges as a result of the NJ Trace program. All local, county, and State law enforcement agencies are mandated to utilize the NJ Trace system, in accordance with the Attorney General’s Law Enforcement Directive No. 2008-1, issued on March 17, 2008.

11c. Community participation is also a part of the Governor’s public safety initiatives. The October press release noted that “...the Attorney General will ask law enforcement professionals to assess current protection programs and develop a new model protection program. Furthermore, the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) ... agreed to provide housing vouchers, redeemable around the country, for witnesses and victims of violent crime.”

In FY 2009, the department responded that this component was still in the planning stages due to a shortage of funding.

- **Question:** Please provide an update on this protection program. Please provide an updated spending plan for the program. What effect, if any, will the increase in federal assistance programs have on the victim witness assistance program?

The Divisions of Criminal Justice and the State Police are in the process of finalizing a new model protection program to serve both the Division of Criminal Justice and the 21 County Prosecutors in the State of New Jersey. The new program will establish a single witness assistance and relocation unit within the Division of Criminal Justice, staffed with sworn
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personnel from the New Jersey State Police and the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice and
unsworn support personnel as necessary.

The new unit will include Deputy Attorneys General from the Division of Criminal Justice who
will perform the legal work associated with the program including the negotiation and
preparation of Memoranda of Understanding with witnesses, and providing legal advice to unit
personnel during the course of the general day-to-day operations of the unit. The witness
assistance and relocation unit will be partially funded by federal grant money to the extent
those funds are available and supplemented with State forfeiture funds. In addition, the
legislature is considering amendments to pending legislation that would allocate certain
surcharge fees from convicted defendants to fund this program in the future.

The Department has allocated from the 2009 JAG Recovery Act funds approximately $700,000
for the State Witness and Relocation Assistance Program (SWRAP).

12. The New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs’ Bureau of Securities, within the
Department of Law and Public Safety, is the State’s securities regulatory agency, registering and
regulating firms and persons selling securities in the State. The bureau regulates brokerage
firms, stockbrokers, investment advisers and their representatives, agents of securities issuers,
securities registrations and exemptions, mutual funds and unit investment advisers. All
penalties and fines from State securities enforcement action are placed into the Securities
Enforcement Fund.

• Question: Please provide the number of licenses that were issued by the bureau,
by type, in FY 2007 and FY 2008? How many cases annually does the bureau
investigate? How many of those cases result in conviction? What role, if any, does
the bureau have in protecting New Jersey investors from fraudulent schemes such as
Bernard Madoff’s hedge fund, Ascot Partners?

The Bureau of Securities, which is overseen by the newly appointed Bureau Chief Mark B.
Minor, accepts filings from applicants for several different classifications of registrations
("licenses") which become effective (eg. are “issued”) after our substantive review.

Below is a spreadsheet showing the relevant statistics, by classification type, for FY 2007 and
2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGISTRATIONS/FILINGS</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker/Dealer (Renewals + New)</td>
<td>2,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Representatives (Renewals + New + Relicensess)</td>
<td>216,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Adviser Firms (Renewals + New) Federal Included</td>
<td>8,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Adviser Representatives (Renewals + New)</td>
<td>29,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Registration</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Exemptions</td>
<td>2,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Funds (New + Renewals)</td>
<td>5,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Investment Trusts</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders (including OAL)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>261,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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During 2008, the Bureau received over 1,700 complaints and inquiries. As of June 30, 2008 there were 108 open investigations 43 of which were opened during the fiscal year.

The Bureau does not handle cases to "conviction"; although the New Jersey Uniform Securities Law provides for criminal sanctions, the Bureau is a civil agency. Criminal cases are referred to Criminal Justice for prosecution. Under the Bureau's jurisdiction, the Bureau Chief can enter Administrative Orders or we can file civil actions in Superior Court. In 2008, Bureau actions resulted in the entry of 77 Orders.

The Bureau’s authority to protect New Jersey investors from fraud, generally, derives from N.J.S.A. 49:3-52 and N.J.S.A. 49:3-53. N.J.S.A. 49:3-52 makes it unlawful for any person who, in connection with the offer, sale or purchase of a security to employ a devise to defraud or make any untrue statement. N.J.S.A. 49:3-53 makes it unlawful for any person who receives compensation from investment advice to "engage in any act, practice, or course of business which operates as a fraud or deceit ..." Generally, the Bureau administers and enforces the Uniform Securities Law which governs various areas including those involving broker-dealers, investment advisers, and financial planners. The Bureau’s jurisdiction encompasses any offer or sale of a security to or from New Jersey.

13. In 1997, the New Jersey Tidal Telemetry System was designed and installed by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) in cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT). Since then, this system supplies the State with real-time tide level and meteorological data for the most flood-prone areas. The system is used as an electronic notification system by emergency management coordinators to monitor flooding throughout the State and to forecast flooding in coastal areas.

The operation of this Tidal Telemetry System is partially funded by the federal government (USGS); however, the remaining costs of the operation ($250,000) is required to be paid by the State. Originally, the New Jersey Department of Transportation partnered with USGS to provide the State's share, however due to the State's fiscal constraints, the DOT was unable to continue that funding. In FY 2008, the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness provided one-time temporary funding.

The Tidal Telemetry System appears to be a critical resource to emergency management coordinators in New Jersey, however it does not appear that funding will be continued through the Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness.

- **Question:** Does the department plan to provide the match to fund the Tidal Telemetry System? If so, how does the Department of Law and Public Safety envision establishing a permanent source of funding for this system?

The Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness will support the cost for the Tidal Telemetry System in FY 2010.

14. The State operates the Northern and Southern Regional State Medical Examiner labs 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The Medicolegal Death Investigations Section specifically conducts investigations in the counties of Essex, Hudson, Passaic, Somerset, Cumberland and Cape May.
Department of Law and Public Safety

FY 2009-2010
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At one point, the department was researching the possibility of building a Central New Jersey State Medical Examiner Lab to meet the additional needs of the State as well as possibly encouraging the consolidation of existing county medical facilities.

- **Question:** What is the status of planning to build a Central New Jersey facility to consolidate other county medical labs?

The Department does not have plans to build a Central New Jersey facility.

15. The Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness (OHSP) is a cabinet level agency tasked with administering, coordinating, leading, and supervising New Jersey’s counter-terrorism and preparedness efforts.

In FY 2010, the OHSP is recommended to receive total State funding of $6.2 million which is a decrease of $7.3 million from the $13.5 million FY 2009 appropriation. The reductions are reflected in cuts to the Domestic Security Task Force ($600,000), Direct State Services ($2.4 million) and State Aid for Capital for Homeland Security and Critical Infrastructure ($4.25 million).

- **Question:** Please provide an overview of how these recommended State budget cuts will affect the overall OHSP budget and mission? How will federal funds, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding, provide temporary assistance to the State? Please provide an update on the accomplishments of the OHSP.

- **Question:** For the FY 2009 State Aid amount, please list the projects, recipients, and amounts allocated from all appropriations to date. Please provide the spending plan for the allocation of uncommitted appropriations and FY 2010 funding, respectively. What percentage of funds expended or committed to date was directed to local governments, and what percentage to State critical infrastructure projects? Has the Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness developed a multi-year funding plan and project priority list that supports the FY 2010 budget recommendation, and will this guide the use of these funds and serve as a basis for future budget recommendations? If so, please provide a copy or summary of that document.

OHSP will utilize carryforward money to compensate for the reduction of $3 million from the Domestic Security Task Force and Direct State Services accounts, and as such, OHSPs mission will not be negatively impacted. The reduction in the State Aid account will result in our being able to fund less projects than we did in previous years.

As mentioned under 1a, there are only two federal homeland security grant programs that will be funded nationally under the ARRA - $150 million for the Port Security Grant Program and $150 million under the Transit Security Grant Program. Both of these programs have very specific focus areas on how the funding can be utilized. Final project determination under the PSGP is ultimately determined by each sector's Area Maritime Security Committee in consultation with the U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port. It is anticipated that ARRA Port Security Grant Program guidance will prioritize initiatives that are focused on shovel-ready capital construction projects that provide for construction-related employment in the northern and southern port areas of New Jersey. Funding under the ARRA TSGP is awarded on a
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competitive basis to the nation's transit agencies including the New Jersey Transit, PATH, PANYNJ and PATCO. Final project determination is made in consultation with each region's Regional Transit Security Working Group in consultation with DHS' Transportation Security Administration. Little information is available at this time concerning how DHS will administer the ARRA funding for TSGP. Similar to the port funding, it is anticipated that ARRA TSGP funding will be focused on capital construction projects that provide for employment. The OHSP will continue to apply its risk based methodology when allocating federal grant funds under the traditional homeland security grant programs it currently administers.

An OHSP Accomplishments update is attached (please see Attachment A).

The FY2009 Appropriations Act included $10,000,000 in State Aid for Capital Homeland Security Critical Infrastructure for projects to support interoperable communications, tools for Intelligence Sharing, and enhanced infrastructure protection. The criteria for the Office of Homeland Security & Preparedness allocation and distribution of this funding are based upon risk (threat, vulnerability and consequence). Funding for projects follow a risk-based system linked to our State preparedness goals to prevent terrorist attacks; protect critical infrastructure and reduce vulnerability to terrorism; build capability to respond to incidents of terrorism quickly and effectively; recover from terrorist attack(s) and other catastrophic events; restore quality of life; support national and State priorities/target capabilities including interoperability, regionalization, and information sharing; and, avoid duplication where wasteful.

In considering funding projects, we also take into consideration "regionalization" for efficiency and more effective projects. For example, in funding preparedness planning we are moving away from the development of individual plans for each community in the State to "regional plans" by utilizing State funds to develop regionalized catastrophic county plans. This allows for a more effective State emergency response and avoids the redundancy of numerous independent local plans. Interoperability is another effort where regionalization and maximizing limited resources is the methodology of choice for funding OHSP has chosen.

In funding projects we have generally taken the approach of seeding efforts rather than building a long term funding stream for any given agency or organization. This is particularly true for the purchase of equipment or systems. We inform recipients that once a system is operational and proven to be effective it is incumbent on the grantee to ensure future maintenance and expansion of these efforts.

Summary Chart:

| Allocated Funds for OHSP Projects | $2,535,000 |
| Allocated Funds to Regional/External Constituents | $5,059,121 |
| Approved Projects – Presently Unallocated | $2,300,690 |
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Allocated Funds for OHSP Projects:

*Intelligence Analytical and Critical Infrastructure/Key Resource Contract Support $2,000,000

Funds will be used for a professional services contract to provide intelligence analytical and critical infrastructure/key resource activity support to OHSP.

*NJ 2-1-1 Partnership $165,000

OHSP funds were used to support the NJ 2-1-1 Partnership. The 2-1-1 Partnership provides the general public with up-to-date information concerning emergency preparedness and disaster planning. This easy-to-remember telephone number is answered 24 hours a day/7 days a week by professional call center operators.

*Public Safety Awareness and Outreach $370,000

Funds are utilized to develop and implement joint public safety awareness and outreach campaigns to build stronger awareness and educate the public. Current campaigns include General Citizen Preparedness, Tips and Leads, NJ ALERT, Special Needs Assessment Program and the Trans-Hudson Transportation Plan.

Allocated Funds to Regional/External Constituents:

*Matching Funds $3,113,997

Funds are used as a cash match requirement to the approximately $9.7 million grant funds under the FY07/08 Port Security Grant Programs for Sector Delaware Bay and NYNJ.

*State Aid Regional Grant Program $500,000

SFY09 funding is being utilized, in combination with $1,500,000 of SFY08 state aid to support regional homeland security and preparedness projects in Atlantic City and Trenton. Both cities were selected to receive $1 million each in support of regional projects and investments that reflected a comprehensive approach to homeland security and emergency preparedness.

*Plume Modeling Analysis $82,500

Funding was subgranted to Rutgers University, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute, to support the interpretation of prospective exposure studies. The main purpose of this funding is to augment or adjust current guidance information used by professionals during emergencies for entrance to or exit from an acute hazardous situation and to understand the stresses on health care resources in support of the regional catastrophic event preparedness planning.

*NJ-DEx $1,362,624

This funding is supplementing $3,000,000 of SFY08 state aid funds and is being used to support the New Jersey Data Exchange (NJ-DEx) Project. NJ-DEx is a multi-jurisdictional data sharing project whereby law enforcement data is extracted from local and county Records Management System (RMS) and Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) systems across the state. This project enables local law enforcement agencies to contribute their data to the NJ-DEx. The federal government through an FBI initiative has a National Data Exchange (N-DEx) program for the nation’s law enforcement agencies. Approximately 15 states thus far have been identified to participate initially either regionally or statewide. Because of our efforts
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with NJ-DEx, New Jersey has been selected as one of the states to serve as a beta test site for the federal system.

Approved Projects – Presently Unallocated:

* Homeland Security Data Network (HSDN) $150,000
The Homeland Security Data Network (HSDN), which allows the federal government to move information and intelligence to the states at the Secret level, is deployed nationwide at 27 fusion centers. Only three states – Texas, New York, and California – currently have HSDN deployed at more than one location. The federal Department of Homeland Security recently authorized New Jersey to obtain HSDN capability at the Office of Homeland Security & Preparedness’ Secure Room, in addition to being deployed at the Regional Intelligence Operation Center (ROIC). With HSDN capability, OHSP will have the ability to collect, disseminate, and exchange both tactical and strategic classified intelligence information throughout OHSP and its partners.

* Special Needs Modular Medical Shelters $700,000
Funding will be subgranted to the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Division of Health Infrastructure Preparedness and Emergency Response to support their Modular Medical Expansion System (MMES). The MMES is designed to provide health and limited medical care when emergencies or disasters overwhelm the healthcare systems or components. MMES provides a scalable, flexible method of employing personnel, plans, equipment and facilities to respond within an “All Hazards” approach to many basic and common healthcare/medical needs and emergency events. The core concept of the MMES is to provide basic medical supportive care beyond the scope of a general shelter, to include special needs and medical needs populations.

* Statewide Emergency Management Systems Gap Initiative $370,000
Funding will be provided to the NJ State Police, Office of Emergency Management, to address operational opportunities for improvement that were identified during the Hurricane Madelynn Tabletop exercise. The Statement of Work (SOW) currently under development includes enhanced plans for the Logistics and Distribution of Commodities; collaboration with the Private Sector possibly through the Infrastructure Advisory Committee (IAC); development of an enhanced post event Sheltering and Interim Housing strategy consistent with the National Disaster Housing Strategy; exploration of innovative housing design solutions and the development of a comprehensive statewide Debris Management strategy and plan.

* BioSafety Level 3 Laboratory $500,000
This two-phased funding will be subgranted to the Cancer Center of NJ to establish a BSL-3 Laboratory to enhance the capability and capacity of the State of New Jersey’s bioterrorism and countermeasures efforts in the event of a bioterrorism event.

* Campus Security Peer Review Assessment $580,690
At their October 23, 2008 meeting, the New Jersey Presidents’ Council adopted a resolution endorsing the development of an on-going peer review program of the campus safety and security practices being utilized at New Jersey colleges and universities. The Campus Safety and Security Committee of the New Jersey President’s Council will develop a process to establish and maintain a state-wide campus safety and security peer review system. Funding will be
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utilized to evaluate New Jersey’s colleges’ and universities’ compliance with identified safety and security best practices.

Expenditure Percentages

OHSP has expended or committed $500,000 or 5% of its state aid funds to local governments and $500,000 or 5% of the funds towards enhancing security at critical infrastructure locations. The balance of the funding was directed to projects that are either regional in nature, benefit many communities or areas of interest, or enhance statewide homeland security and preparedness capabilities and capacity.

Multi-year Funding Plan and Prioritization for FY 10

Fulfilling a requirement from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the OHSP has recently updated the State Preparedness Report (SPR) with the full support and input of all major State agencies. The SPR identifies the capabilities and accomplishments of New Jersey’s all-hazards preparedness program. It is both a measure of past capabilities and accomplishments, combined with an estimate of future capabilities. The State Preparedness Report tracks statewide planning and incident management efforts, current preparedness capability levels, targeted levels of capability, aggregate preparedness expenditures, and estimates of the total monetary and non-monetary resources needed to support all preparedness related activities for a three-year period. The SPR creates a comprehensive three-year blueprint plan for identifying gaps in our ability to enhance our protection and reduce our vulnerability to terrorist attacks. This plan will provide the funding targets for FY09, FY10 and FY11. (Attached - State Preparedness Report – Summary – See Attachment B)

The Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness will also apply its overall risk-based funding strategy for the development of specific projects for the FY 2010 state aid budget. Specific projects will be identified through an analysis of all hazard and terrorism risk assessments and funded pursuant to an evaluation of capability and resources gaps. These funds will also leverage federal homeland security grants to promote sustainability and allow us to assess local needs and fund regional solutions.

Although we have not identified specific projects for the FY 2010 state aid budget, we plan on using the risk-based methodology developed by this office supported by the extensive work in the development of the SPR and will evaluate projects such as: school security, interoperability, regional planning, commuter/freight rail transportation security, target hardening initiatives at critical infrastructure and key resources, all hazard information-sharing, cyber security, statewide threat assessment initiatives, port security projects and matching funds.
1) Oversee Distribution of Federal & State Homeland Security Funding

- OHSP manages 10 discretionary state and federal homeland security and distributes funds using a risk-based formula- using threat, vulnerability and consequence.
- New Jersey’s UASI area, the seven counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic and Union is one of 62 UASI areas in the nation as designated by US DHS.
- New Jersey’s UASI is one of only seven Tier 1 areas considered by US DHS to be at greater risk of terrorist attack.
- Since the creation of OHSP in 2006, New Jersey’s UASI area has been awarded more than $105.4 million in homeland security funds to help build capacity to prevent, respond to and recover from acts of terror.
- In 2008, 13 non-profit organizations, schools, hospitals, religious organizations located in New Jersey’s UASI area shared almost $835,000 in homeland security funds to improve their security through “target-hardening” activities such as purchase and installation of physical security equipment or security-related training for organization personnel.
- In 2008, OHSP oversaw the distribution of more than $22.2 million in federal homeland security funds directly to the state’s 21 counties - $3 million more than the amount awarded in the prior year (15% increase).
- Using the risk-based mandate I set when I created OHSP, counties are able to use their funds to properly equip and train emergency responders, protect the state’s critical facilities against potential terrorist attacks and develop and/or continue a variety of other homeland security and domestic preparedness initiatives.
- OHSP’s risk-based formula relies heavily on risk assessments of the more than 200 critical facilities and sites identified by state and federal authorities as the most significant potential targets in our key infrastructure sectors, including: Chemical and Hazardous Materials, Banking and Finance, Energy and Telecommunications, Public Health, and of course Transportation.
- In 2008 and 2009, more than $447 million in federal dollars is available for transit and port security enhancements in both the northern and southern parts of the state.
- For 2009, OHSP will help manage more than $62 million in federal port security grants, of which more than $43 million will be used in and around North Jersey ports and more than $19 million to be used in and around South Jersey ports.
- Since 2006, New Jersey has been awarded more than $33 million to improve interoperable emergency communications - a key recommendation of the 9/11 Commission.
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2) **PARTNER WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR & WORK TO KEEP THE PUBLIC ENGAGED**
   - OHSP works with the private sector to assist us in protecting facilities against potential terrorism as well as all types of "all hazards" incidents.
   - Established the Director's PSAC-Public Safety Advisory Committee-a kitchen-cabinet of private sector leaders, to advise the Director on important homeland security policy matters.
   - Enhanced the Infrastructure Advisory Council and added members from the state's key critical industries such as energy, water, chemical facilities and banking/finance.
   - Established Preparedness College, with a faculty of subject-matter experts who will study the state's current capabilities, identify strengths and weaknesses, and recommend policies to improve state's level of preparedness.
   - Established a first of its kind partnership with CSXT, a leader in the rail industry and the State of New York.
   - CSXT made its Network Operations Workstation (NOW) System, an online tool that enables security and law enforcement officials to track the location and contents of CSXT rail cars in each state, available to New Jersey and New York security and law enforcement officials.
   - NOW increases New Jersey and New York's ability to share information and resources to better protect communities and rail infrastructure in both states.
   - NOW provides invaluable situational awareness to first responders and incident managers, ensuring that first responders arrive on scene with the necessary specialized equipment to effectively respond to the emergency.

**Public Outreach Initiatives**
   - OHSP operates with the notion that "a well-engaged and well-informed citizenry is a critical component of New Jersey's homeland security strategy."
   - Using federal funds, OHSP contracted with Rutgers University to conduct telephone surveys of state residents to determine their level of preparedness in case of an emergency. Residents were asked to respond to questions about their individual, family and community level of preparedness and how they would respond to a certain scenarios, such as hurricanes, floods or terrorist attacks.
   - OHSP launched an enhanced aggressive public awareness campaign encouraging residents to report suspicious activity to the state's toll-free and 24-hour terrorism tip line, 1-866-4SAFE-NJ and to tips@njhomelandsecurity.gov, a newly established email address.
   - The campaign also included distributing newly designed poster boards intended to capture the public's attention, which include the phrase, "Our Most Effective Weapon Against Terrorism is You, If You Suspect It, Report It." The posters prominently feature the terrorism tip line and email address and have been displayed in local police stations, places of business and other public facilities throughout the state.
   - OHSP continues to enhance its partnership with NJ 211, the state's free informational telephone system.
   - OHSP has brought NJ 211 into the emergency preparedness framework, using the 211 infrastructure and platform as a way to communicate important information with New Jersey residents, before, during and after any type of emergency.
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- OHSP provides NJ 211 call-takers with relevant information pertinent to a given type of emergency incident that can be shared with residents who are in need of information, pre and/or post emergency.

3) PARTNER WITH FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT & EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCIES

- Investigators work to detect, deter, and disrupt terrorist activity by developing all-source information on suspected terrorist activity; conduct investigations, follow up on information derived from the Tips & Leads telephone line; and remain aware of signs, trends and patterns related to potential domestic and international terrorism.
- Investigators are assigned to the FBI’s Joint Terrorism Task Forces in New York, Newark and Philadelphia and work closely with the FBI on terrorism-related investigations.
- Under the County Initiative, investigators are assigned to individual counties and work closely with the County Prosecutor’s Office and maintain situational awareness on all-crimes within their assigned county.
- OHSP awarded federal homeland security funds to Atlantic and Hudson Counties, two critical areas of the state for construction improvements and equipment installation at their county Emergency Operations Centers.
- OHSP published the state’s first statewide terrorism threat assessment and distributed copies to hundreds of law enforcement agencies and other appropriate public and private sector stakeholders throughout the state.
- OHSP, in close coordination with the State Police and NJ Office of Information Technology, is working to identify ways to improve communications, data and information sharing at multiple levels of government.
- OHSP invested state homeland security funds for projects to enhance interoperable communications in key areas of the state, including $1 million in state homeland security funds to Atlantic City, and $682,520 to support the six South Jersey counties served by the South Jersey Transportation Authority.
- OHSP invested federal homeland security funds to equip each county Office of Emergency Management with satellite telephones to be used by first responders to communicate when cellular and landline telephone communications fail.
- OHSP awarded $1 million in state homeland security funds to the City of Trenton to expand the emergency response capabilities of first responders and emergency personnel in the Mercer County region, including areas in Pennsylvania.
- OHSP has regularly published intelligence analyses on subjects such as the terror threat to passenger rail, terrorist use of containerized shipping, the terror threat to ferries, home-grown radicalization, and the threat from radiological devices.
- OHSP is responsible for developing and administering homeland security and domestic preparedness training programs across all levels of New Jersey government, the private sector, higher education institutions, and non-profit organizations.
- 140,000 state, county and local law enforcement personnel, first responders (Fire & EMS), state agencies and nonprofit organizations have completed 250,000 training courses using NJ Learn, the state’s on-line training catalog.
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NJ DEx – New Jersey Data Exchange

- OHSP has undertaken an initiative known as NJDEx to enhance the information-sharing practices of state, county and municipal law enforcement agencies, and is accessible to approximately 95% of all law enforcement officers within the State.
- Ten (10) of the 21 counties, including municipal agencies, will be linked to the State through NJDEx. Realizing the UASI region and the Urban 15/Ceasefire cities account for approximately 75-80% of the law enforcement activity in the State, we have prioritized the inclusion of the UASI region, these cities and counties.
- NJDEx is projected to reach 70-80% contributing police agencies throughout the State, with 80-90% of criminal activity.
- Enhanced search features currently being developed will allow officers and analysts to drill down into the data through certain filters and criteria. Other advanced features will include an improved, faster search engine technology and more sophisticated analysis tools.
- NJDEx will include the sharing of narrative data from police reports. This will increase both the investigative and analytical value as trends and patterns may become evident in the narrative. NJSP is working on extracting their Record Management System (RMS) narratives to load into NJDEx.
- NJDEx will participate in the federal/FBI national data exchange program (N-DEx). Because of our efforts with NJDEx, New Jersey has been selected as one of only 15 states to participate either regionally or statewide and will serve as a beta test site for the federal program.

4) TAKEN PRO-ACTIVE MEASURES TO IMPROVE SCHOOL SECURITY

K-12 School Security Task Force

- AG distributed (2007) model policies concerning active shooter, bomb threats, lockdown, evacuation, public information
- DOE Commissioner distributed (2007) companion model policies focused on the roles of administrators and teachers during a crisis.
- Conducted joint training (2007) for county prosecutors and county school superintendents to review school security strategies and programs.
- Revised uniform MOA between education and law enforcement that guides interactions of educators and police.
- Created NJ DOE School Security Web site.
- Legislation pending (A3002) to require monthly school security drills. Current requirement is for 2 fire drills/month – this legislation would replace one fire drill with a “security-related” drill.

School Personnel Training Program

- OHSP, in collaboration with DOE and the NJEA, created a 90-minute interactive CD for school administrators, faculty and staff.
- CD offers training on rapid response procedures to four basic scenarios:
  - Active shooter in a school
  - School Lockdown
  - Bomb threat
  - Non-Fire Evacuation
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College & University Campus Security
Campus Security Task Force
Implementation of Task Force Recommendations
  • So far, our colleges and universities have:
    o Enhanced existing emergency notification plans with greater emphasis on the importance of emergency communications.
    o We have found that schools are now investing more in redundant delivery methods to ensure that students receive timely notification.
    o Provided mental health awareness training for students, faculty and staff, using $165 in OHSP state funds, authorized by the Governor.
    o Mental health training was designed by the task force's mental health subcommittee and focuses specifically on ways to identify and proactively and preventively deal with a person or persons who may be a likely threat.
    o Exercised/plan to exercise their emergency management plans.
    o Been integrated into the greater county and local emergency management framework, this includes being tapped into the emergency management communications network.

Campus “Peer Review” of Emergency Management Plans
  • OHSP funding and collaborating with NJ Council of College Presidents (Campus Security Sub-Committee) to implement a 3-year review to audit/amend emergency plans at all 59 colleges in NJ.
New Jersey determined that the requirement to complete a State Preparedness Report presented a unique opportunity to address all 37 Target Capabilities and their respective activities with "critical tasks." As such, we have added three State Priorities and expanded some of the National Priorities to include additional Target Capabilities to present a truly comprehensive State Preparedness Report. The gathering and compilation of the information necessary to complete the State Preparedness Report was a monumental task accomplished by hundreds of New Jerseyans from all levels of government and first responder/care giver disciplines. This report will guide New Jersey's efforts to enhance our capabilities to protect from, prevent against, respond to and recovery from a terrorist attack or other disaster.

State Background

New Jersey is a state in the Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern regions of the United States. It is bordered on the north by New York, east by the Atlantic Ocean, southwest by Delaware and west by Pennsylvania. Portions of New Jersey lie within the sprawling metropolitan areas of New York and Philadelphia. Basic characteristics of New Jersey are summarized below.

As the most densely populated state in the United States, and as a state that serves as a corridor between New York City and Philadelphia (the country's largest and fifth largest cities), New Jersey and its highways are traversed by millions of travelers daily. Newark Liberty Airport handles 30 million passengers on 300,000 flights each year. Amtrak trains regularly cross the state traveling to and from the nearby cities of New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Washington, D.C. The Port of New York/New Jersey is the largest port complex on the East Coast and has immediate access to distribute imported and domestic goods through the most extensive interstate highway network in the region, as well as along one of the largest freight rail systems in the United States, serving more that 80 million Americans. In the Philadelphia metropolitan area, Delaware River ports are also active in commerce.

New Jersey has an immensity of critical infrastructure - 17 designated sectors and numerous sub sectors - which service and support local, state, regional and international interests and which are integral to the functioning of those economies. New Jersey is the nerve center of the biopharmaceutical, telecommunications and chemical industries; it stores major reserves of heating oil for the Northeastern seaboard; it operates a multi-node transit system that shuttles thousands of commuters daily intrastate and interstate to and between Philadelphia and New York; and Northern New Jersey has an abundance of critical infrastructure - chemical plants, nuclear power plants, financial centers, rail yards, rail lines, refineries and pipeline.
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In addition to the enormous potential human toll, any significant terrorist attack in New Jersey could cripple the Northeast transportation system and the United States economy.

Risks, Hazards, Planning Factors

In order to attain a more quantitative understanding of the risks it faces and to better inform our investment of limited resources, the state of New Jersey conducted an all hazard and terrorism risk assessment. The outcomes of the assessment have assisted the state in understanding key capability gaps and resource needs and planning to address those gaps. Through examination of the available Threat, Consequence and Vulnerability information, the following conclusions were drawn.

Threats: Specific areas of concern are the threats to the transportation, financial, chemical, commuter rail and government facilities. Sectors facing a lesser but significant threat are petroleum/gas, pharmaceutical and the state’s information technology systems.

Consequences: The state houses major clusters of high density population and high density critical infrastructures/ key assets. As such, the consequences that stem from attack or natural disaster can be “catastrophic.”

Vulnerabilities: The state has identified gaps in our ability to effectively reduce vulnerabilities at these facilities and has prioritized investments that develop our capacity to detect and respond to CBRNE and VBIED events.

After examining New Jersey’s all hazard and terrorism risks, it becomes very clear that some generalizations may be made. First, the most probable and frequent all hazard risks will involve weather related emergencies involving excessive water/wind or a hazardous material incident. Second, New Jersey, with its multitude of critical infrastructure and high population density, is a target rich environment. The attractiveness of New Jersey is compounded by the fact we are sandwiched between New York City and the City of Philadelphia. A well-placed attack would probably yield mass casualties, serious psychological impact and economic devastation, crowning objectives of a terrorist attacker.

Common tasks that apply to either the all hazard or terrorism risks for New Jersey are: (1) The need to be able to move and provide short or long term care for significant numbers of victims and/or evacuees. This includes transportation, feeding, lodging, medical attention, water, communication, and restoration of governmental/life sustaining services. (2) In an effort to uncover and disrupt a terrorist attack, the fusion (gathering, analysis and distribution) of information, detection of potential weapons and enhancement of physical security at critical infrastructure sites is a high priority. We must prevent the weaponization of critical infrastructure or the destruction of the life supporting services provided by such critical infrastructure.
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Stakeholder Input

New Jersey has been and remains cognizant of the need to include and encourage the active involvement of pertinent participants representing all relevant disciplines in the process of homeland security planning. The state level working/planning group is chaired by a representative from the Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness (OHSP). Within each county government, a mirrored multi-discipline working group is convened to act on the operational and procurement details of the programs. The County Working Group (CWG) is staffed with representatives from the various disciplines of first responders and key representatives of the county governmental structure believed to be the core disciplines needed to effectively and intelligently discuss issues relating to prevention, mitigation and recovery/response to a terrorist attack. The members of the CWG meet regularly to prioritize and develop the strategies and spending plan proposals based upon the needs and information they receive from the county, municipal and private sector participants.

Partners in our UASI region, defined as the 2 principal cities of Newark and Jersey City and the host (Essex and Hudson) and surrounding counties (Bergen, Union, Morris, Passaic, and Middlesex) contribute staff to the Urban Areas Working Group as well as having a seat on the UASI Region Executive Committee. Local and state level subject matter experts within the UASI region chair subcommittees to develop regional approaches within our UASI region to increase levels of capability, define appropriate participant roles and responsibilities, and complete Investment Justifications for the Homeland Security Grant Program.

With the inception of the “Capabilities Based Planning Process” in FY06, the state of New Jersey identified the most appropriate state agency, for each of the 8 National Priorities and 37 Target Capabilities, to serve as our principle point of coordination (PPOC) in the development of statewide planning for their respective national priority or target capability. Each PPOC was charged to develop a statewide plan to enhance our level of capability, which includes the clarification of appropriate roles and responsibilities for the different levels of government (state, county and municipal) as well as various first responder disciplines. To complete this assignment, each PPOC selected a member of their staff to assemble and chair a subject matter expert committee comprised of state, county, UASI region and private sector representatives if appropriate.

Priorities

The FY08 New Jersey State Preparedness Report (SPR) has been designed to address all 37 Target Capabilities housed within eight National Priorities and three State Priorities. State officials have determined that all capabilities, with their respective activities and “critical tasks” require an assessment of capability levels, identification of gaps, development of improvement plans and implementation plan for each priority.