



# *Housing Drug Survey*

*June 1990*

7-12-93  
MFI  
138576

*Prepared by  
New York State  
Division of Housing and Community Renewal  
Anti-Drug Program  
One Fordham Plaza | Bronx, NY 10458*

MARIO M. CUOMO, GOVERNOR

RICHARD L. HIGGINS, COMMISSIONER

HOUSING DRUG SURVEY

In concert with Governor Mario Cuomo's creation of New York State's Anti-Drug Abuse Council, State Housing Commissioner Richard L. Higgins established DHCR's Anti-Drug Program in January 1989 to address the problems of illegal drugs and drug-related crimes in State-supervised housing. Reports of drug problems spreading into many communities in the State and throughout the nation pointed to the need for New York to assess the situation in its own communities.

The DHCR Housing Drug Survey which appears in the following pages represents one of the major initiatives of DHCR's Anti-Drug Program. This "informed source" survey provides for the first time a reliable indication of the impact of illegal drugs in State-supervised housing. Housing managers were asked to assess the nature and extent of drug-related problems in the State's inventory of 267 middle-income housing developments (containing over 107,000 apartments), and 72 public housing projects (with approximately 21,000 apartments).

The two-year period covered in this report, 1988 and 1989, have been referred to by substance abuse and law enforcement experts as among the peak years of the present drug crisis, intensified by the highly addictive nature of "crack" cocaine and the increased street-level trafficking it generated. The first signs of this epidemic appeared in many cities and towns in 1987, and rapidly spread across the nation since that time.

In attempting to capture the situation during this period, this report reflects not only the data reported by the State's housing managers, but also their continuous efforts to deal with the challenges of preserving the safety and well-being of their residents and their projects. Numerous comments and valuable suggestions they submitted regarding such efforts appear in Part III of this report.

138576

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

New York State Division of Housing  
and Community Renewal

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

It is important to note that managers responding to the survey who indicated "yes" to the presence of illegal drugs in their projects were not asked to gauge the severity of the problem, due to the difficulty of establishing a valid standard against which to measure such responses. Therefore, all projects which simply indicated illegal drug presence were treated alike with regard to this point.

Also, it should be noted that the responses to some of the questions in the questionnaire did not lend themselves to meaningful analysis and, therefore, those questions were omitted from this report.

\* \* \*

This report contains four basic parts:

- I. Summary
- II. Analysis of Data
- III. Comments and Recommendations from Housing Managers
- IV. Questionnaire (Survey Instrument)

\* \* \*

Preparation of this survey and report was directed by Aiyong Choi Garcia, Coordinator of the Anti-Drug Program, with invaluable assistance from David Sussman (Housing Management) in designing and screening the survey, Eric Williams (Enhancement Unit, Housing Audits and Accounts) in ensuring data integrity and format, and Claire Schaffer (Public Information) in analyzing the data and for her special role in preparing this report. Much appreciation is due to each of these individuals for their outstanding contributions to the success of this project, and to their managers for their cooperation and support.

## I. SUMMARY

The DHCR Housing Drug Survey was conducted among State-supervised housing developments from January to April 1990.

Housing managers were sent questionnaires that asked about their perception of drug and drug-related problems in their developments. Questionnaires were received from 220 middle-income developments and 52 public housing projects, a return rate of 82% and 72%, respectively.

Managers were asked two key questions about illegal drugs in their developments: whether they believed there was illegal drug use anywhere in the development and whether they believed there was illegal drug dealing anywhere in the development.

Nearly all of the drug use/dealing was reported for family projects (those with no age or staff housing restrictions). Family public housing projects reported drug use in 84% of the projects and drug dealing in 74%. Family middle-income projects reported 65% having drug use and 40% with drug dealing.

Generally, of family projects, there were higher proportions of reported drug use/dealing in rentals than in co-ops, in downstate\* area projects than in upstate\* ones, and in larger projects (over 300 units) than in smaller ones.

For example, in public housing, large family projects in the downstate area reported drug use in all 12 projects, and dealing in 11. Smaller upstate family projects reported drug use in 16 of the 23 projects (70%), and drug dealing in 13 of the 23 (57%). In middle-income developments, larger family rentals in the downstate area indicated drug use in all 37 projects and drug dealing in 27 of the 37 projects (73%), while smaller upstate family rental developments showed drug use in 21 of 40 projects (53%), and drug dealing in 9 of 40 (23%).

Similarly, drug dealing was noticed earliest in large public housing projects downstate (32 months previous to the survey, on average), and next in large middle-income developments downstate (27 months).

The reasons given most often for no drug dealing in family projects were: no major influx of drugs in the area, security guards, and police activity.

There was more increase than decrease reported for vandalism and loitering, which are often related to drug problems. 36% of the managers of family projects reported that vandalism and loitering had increased from 1988 to 1989, while no more than 10% believed these had decreased.

Looking at all projects, the crime prevention measures implemented most frequently were liaison with local police (59%), and locked entrances (50%). The measures believed to be most effective in projects that implemented them were electronic surveillance, window gates and locked entrances.

The three drugs mentioned most often as cited in complaints about drug dealing were, in order of frequency, crack, cocaine and marijuana.

\*In this report, "upstate" refers to all of New York State North of Westchester and Rockland. "Downstate" refers to Suffolk, Nassau, New York City, Westchester and Rockland.

## II. ANALYSIS OF DATA

TABLE 1. QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN RATE BY PROJECT CATEGORY

	<u>MIDDLE INCOME</u>			<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>		
	<u># Projects</u>	<u># Q'res Ret'd</u>	<u>Return Rate</u>	<u># Projects</u>	<u># Q'res Ret'd</u>	<u>Return Rate</u>
Family	164	141	86%	58	43	74%
Senior Citizen	78	66	85%	14	9	64%
Staff	25	13	52%	0	0	-
Cooperative	46	34	74%	0	0	-
Rental	221	186	84%	72	52	72%
1-300 Units	177	141	80%	57	39	68%
301 + Units	90	79	88%	15	13	87%
Upstate	110	107	97%	46	32	70%
Downstate	157	113	72%	26	20	77%
Total	267*	220	82%	72*	52	72%

Questionnaires were mailed to the management of all State-supervised housing developments built under the Public Housing, Mitchell-Lama and Limited Dividend programs. Of the 267 middle-income developments (Mitchell-Lama and Limited Dividend), 220 questionnaires were returned - a return rate of 82%. Of the 72 public housing projects built with State aid and under State supervision, 52 questionnaires were returned - a return rate of 72%.

Table 1 also shows the return rate for the four classification categories: type of residence - family, senior citizen or staff (hospital or college); type of ownership - co-op or rental; size - 300 units or less, and more than 300 units; and location - upstate and downstate. High return rates within a classification category indicate that the questionnaire results for that category are more representative, and therefore, more reliable, than results for categories with low return rates. For example, nearly all the upstate middle-income developments responded, while more than one-fourth of the middle-income developments in the downstate area did not respond. The replies from upstate middle-income developments, therefore, are highly representative.

\*For tabulation purposes we have used figures of 267 middle-income developments and 72 public housing projects as the total under State supervision. These figures vary slightly from the official inventory of 271 and 74, but were used to reflect those instances where a single questionnaire was submitted for more than one development or project (generally, projects with more than one section).

TABLE 2. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING BY PRIVATE/PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

	<u>MIDDLE INCOME</u>		<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>	
Drug Use "Yes"	(97)	44%	(37)	71%
Drug Dealing "Yes"	(58)	26%	(33)	63%
Total	(220) = 100%		(52) = 100%	

Managers were asked two key questions:

- 1) "Do you believe there is illegal drug use anywhere in this development at this time?" and
- 2) "Do you believe there is drug dealing anywhere in this development at this time?"

All respondents who answered "yes" to the question on drug dealing also are counted in the "yes" responses to drug use. Drug dealing, thus, is treated as a subcategory of drug use, and as an indicator of a greater degree of drug problem.

There is a much higher rate of perceived drug use and drug dealing in public housing than in middle-income housing. Less than half of the managers of middle-income developments believed there was some drug use in their projects, and only a fourth felt there was some drug dealing. In public housing the figures were 71% and 63%, respectively.



TABLE 3. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING BY PRIVATE/PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND RESIDENCE TYPE

	<u>MIDDLE INCOME</u>						<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>			
	<u>Family</u>		<u>Sr. Citizen</u>		<u>Staff</u>		<u>Family</u>		<u>Sr.Citizen</u>	
Drug Use	(92)	65%	( 2)	3%	( 3)	23%	(36)	84%	(1)	11%
Drug Dealing	(56)	40%	( 0)	-	( 2)	15%	(32)	74%	(1)	11%
Total	(141)=100%		(66)=100%		(13)=100%		(43)=100%		(9)=100%	

Nearly all of the drug use and dealing is reported for family projects. Only six non-family developments (senior citizen and staff housing) reported drug use, and of these, only three reported drug dealing. Because non-family projects account for such a small part of the drug problems, these projects were excluded from the following seven tables (Tables 4-10) in order to gauge the effect of the other classification variables with less confounding.

Drug use was reported in 65%, and drug dealing in 40% of middle-income family projects. Public housing family projects reported drug use in 84% of projects and drug dealing in 74%.

TABLE 4. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING BY PRIVATE/PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND LOCATION - Family Projects Only

	<u>MIDDLE-INCOME</u>				<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>			
	<u>Upstate</u>		<u>Downstate</u>		<u>Upstate</u>		<u>Downstate</u>	
Drug Use	(34)	59%	(58)	70%	(17)	71%	(19)	100%
Drug Dealing	(15)	26%	(41)	49%	(14)	58%	(18)	95%
Total	(58)=100%		(83)=100%		(24)=100%		(19)=100%	

Table 4 indicates that, for both middle-income and public housing, a higher percentage of family projects in the downstate area report drug use and drug dealing than those upstate. Nearly half the downstate middle-income projects report drug dealing, compared to a fourth of the upstate ones.

In public housing, nearly all the projects in the downstate area report drug dealing, as opposed to only 58% upstate.

TABLE 5. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING BY PRIVATE/PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND SIZE - Family Projects Only

	<u>MIDDLE-INCOME</u>				<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>			
	<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301 + Units</u>		<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301 + Units</u>	
Drug Use	(36)	51%	(56)	= 80%	(23)	77%	(13)	100%
Drug Dealing	(18)	25%	(38)	= 54%	(20)	67%	(12)	92%
Total	(71) = 100%		(70) = 100%		(30) = 100%		(13) = 100%	

This table is similar to table 4, except that it breaks down drug use/dealing by project size. Both in middle-income and in public housing projects, there is more drug use and drug dealing reported for larger projects than for smaller ones.

TABLE 6. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING BY PRIVATE/PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND LOCATION/SIZE - Family Projects Only

	<u>UPSTATE</u>				<u>DOWNSTATE</u>			
	<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301 + Units</u>		<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301 + Units</u>	
<u>MIDDLE-INCOME</u>								
Drug Use	(22)	52%	(12)	75%	(14)	48%	(44)	81%
Drug Dealing	( 9)	21%	( 6)	38%	( 9)	31%	(32)	59%
TOTAL	(42)	= 100%	(16)	= 100%	(29)	= 100%	(54)	= 100%
<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>								
Drug Use	(16)	70%	( 1)	= 100%	( 7)	= 100%	(12)	= 100%
Drug Dealing	(13)	57%	( 1)	= 100%	( 7)	= 100%	(11)	= 92%
TOTAL	(23)	= 100%	( 1)	= 100%	( 7)	= 100%	(12)	= 100%

Table 6 examines drug use and drug dealing by both size and location.

In middle-income projects, there is much more drug use in larger projects than in smaller ones, irrespective of geographic area. Location essentially makes no difference when looking at projects in the same size category. For drug dealing, size and location both seem to be independent factors, with the smallest percent reporting any dealing in small upstate projects (21%, or 9 projects), and the largest percent (59%, or 32 projects) in large, downstate area developments. Drug dealing may be a more sensitive indicator of differences than drug use. Also, large downstate area projects may be bigger than large upstate projects.

In public housing projects, only the small upstate projects show less than (nearly) universal reports of drug use and dealing. Only one large upstate public housing project reported, so comparisons cannot be made for that category. For the smaller upstate public housing projects, 70% report drug use and 57% report drug dealing.

TABLE 7. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING - MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILY PROJECTS - BY RENTAL/CO-OP

	<u>RENTAL</u>		<u>CO-OP</u>	
Drug Use	(81)	76%	(11)	32%
Drug Dealing	(50)	47%	( 6)	18%
Total	(107) = 100%		(34) = 100%	

Of the middle-income family projects that responded, 107 are rentals and only 34 are co-ops. Rental projects report a much higher proportion of drug use and drug dealing than do co-ops.

TABLE 8. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING - MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILY PROJECTS - BY RENTAL/CO-OP AND SIZE

	<u>RENTAL</u>				<u>CO-OP</u>			
	<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301 + Units</u>		<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301 + Units</u>	
Drug Use	(32)	58%	(49)	94%	( 4)	25%	( 7)	39%
Drug Dealing	(17)	31%	(33)	63%	( 1)	6%	( 5)	28%
Total	(55) = 100%		(52) = 100%		(16) = 100%		(18) = 100%	

Rental projects (family, middle-income) show much greater rates of drug problems than co-ops. Small rental projects have more than twice the proportion reporting drug problems than small co-ops, and similarly for large and small rentals. But even small rentals have more drug reports than large co-ops.

While rental developments show greater proportions of perceived drug use and dealing than co-ops, regardless of size category, the size of the development also makes a significant difference. 94% of large rentals reported drug use, and 63% reported drug dealing, roughly twice the proportion as the smaller rental projects. Large co-ops also reported more drug use and dealing than smaller co-ops.

TABLE 9. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING - MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILY PROJECTS - BY RENTAL/CO-OP AND LOCATION

	<u>RENTAL</u>		<u>CO-OP</u>	
	<u>Upstate</u>	<u>Downstate</u>	<u>Upstate</u>	<u>Downstate</u>
Drug Use	(33) 60%	(48) 92%	(1) 33%	(10) 32%
Drug Dealing	(15) 27%	(35) 67%	(0) -	(6) 19%
Total	(55)=100%	(52)=100%	(3)=100%	(31)=100%

Of the middle-income family rental projects, those downstate report more drug use and drug dealing than those upstate. The drug use/dealing percentages for upstate and downstate projects are similar to those for small and large projects (Table 8). Nearly all the co-ops are downstate, and these have fewer reports of drug use and dealing than the rentals, upstate or downstate.

TABLE 10. DRUG USE AND DRUG DEALING - MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILY RENTAL PROJECTS - BY LOCATION AND SIZE

	<u>UPSTATE</u>				<u>DOWNSTATE</u>			
	<u>1-300 Unite</u>		<u>301+ Units</u>		<u>1-300 Units</u>		<u>301+ Units</u>	
Drug Use	(21)	53%	(12)	80%	(11)	73%	(37)	100%
Drug Dealing	( 9)	23%	( 6)	40%	( 8)	53%	(27)	73%
Total	(40)=100%		(15)=100%		(15)=100%		(37)=100%	

Within each geographic area (upstate/downstate), the larger developments (middle-income family rentals) report more drug problems than the smaller ones. Within size category (smaller/larger), downstate rental developments report more drug problem than upstate ones.

The 37 large downstate middle-income family rental projects had very high rates of reported drug use and dealing: 100% and 73% respectively.

TABLE 11. FIRST NOTICE OF DRUG DEALING - AVERAGE NUMBER OF MONTHS

	<u>MIDDLE-INCOME</u>		<u>PUBLIC HOUSING</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>Av. Mos.</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Av. Mos.</u>
Number reporting time	(41)	24	(20)	25
<u>1-300 Units</u>				
Upstate	(10)	20	(13)	24
Downstate	( 6)	19	( 3)	22
<u>301 + Units</u>				
Upstate	( 3)	21	( 0)	--
Downstate	(22)	27	( 4)	32
Number reporting drug dealing (all developments):	(58)		(33)	

Respondents who answered "yes" to Question E: "Do you believe there is drug dealing anywhere in this development at this time?" were also asked Question F: "How many months ago was drug dealing first noticed?"

A number of respondents who answered "yes" to Question E did not answer Question F. 58 middle-income managers said they believed there was drug dealing, of which 41 ventured an estimate of when it was first noticed. Among public housing managers 33 reported there was drug dealing, of which 20 estimated when it was first noticed.

Drug dealing was noticed earliest in large public housing projects downstate (an average of 32 months prior to the survey), and next in large middle-income projects downstate (an average of 27 months).

---

TABLE 12. DRUGS CITED IN DRUG-DEALING COMPLAINTS

Cocaine	(63)	58%
Crack	(86)	80%
Heroin	(13)	12%
Marijuana	(59)	55%
Pills	( 5)	5%
Other	<u>(16)</u>	<u>15%</u>

Number responding to question: 107 = 100%  
(Most cited more than one type of drug)

---

In the questionnaire, Question K-8 asked respondents to check off the type of drug in response to: "Most complaints cite dealing in the following kinds of drugs." Crack, cocaine and marijuana were checked as the illegal drugs most frequently cited in complaints of drug dealing.



TABLE 13.

## REASONS FOR NO DRUG DEALING

	<u>Family</u>		<u>Sr. Cit. &amp; Staff</u>	
No major influx in area	(39)	41%	(16)	19%
Community drug prevention & ed.	(17)	18%	( 2)	2%
Organized tenant patrol	(11)	12%	( 1)	1%
Security guards	(39)	41%	(12)	14%
Security systems	(18)	19%	(12)	14%
Police activity	(31)	33%	( 2)	2%
Evictions	(17)	18%	( 2)	2%
Senior Citizen Development/ many sr. citizens	( 9)	10%	(74)	88%
Other	(23)	24%	(10)	12%
Number reporting no drug dealing:	(94)	100%	(84)	100%

Respondents who said they did not believe there was drug dealing in their development were asked the reason (Question G). For family projects, the reasons cited most often were "No major influx of drugs in area" (41%), and "Security guards" (41%). "Police activity" was also cited frequently (33%). For non-family developments, the most frequent reason cited was "Senior citizen development" (88%).

For comments submitted by managers in response to this question, please refer to Part III.A. of this report.

TABLE 14. CHANGES IN VANDALISM/LOITERING FROM 1988-1989  
Family Projects Only

	<u>Vandalism:</u> <u>General Impression</u>	<u>Loitering</u>
None	22%	29%
Increased	36%	36%
Decreased	10%	9%
No Change	28%	23%
(No Answer)	4%	3%
Family projects: (184) = 100%		(184) = 100%

Question I asked managers to indicate if vandalism increased, decreased or remained unchanged from 1988 to 1989 in various locations in the development. Question J asked about changes in loitering.

There was a high rate of no answers to the specific areas of vandalism (not in table - see questionnaire), up to 30%, indicating that managers found it difficult to assess changes in specific areas. "General impression" and "loitering" were selected for this table because they are broad categories and had the lowest non-response rate.

A plurality of the respondents (36%) indicated that vandalism and loitering had generally increased. Only 10% believed vandalism had decreased and 9% believed loitering had decreased.

TABLE 15. CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED

	<u>Projects Implementing</u>	
Electronic surveillance*	( 39 )	14%
Window gates*	( 42 )	15%
Locked entrances*	(135)	50%
Fencing*	( 66 )	24%
More security guards	( 62 )	23%
Tenant patrols	( 38 )	14%
Tenant education	( 98 )	36%
Liaison with police	(161)	59%
Special staff training	( 65 )	24%
All projects:	(272)	= 100%

Respondents were asked to indicate what specific crime-prevention programs or measures had been implemented in their developments. Liaison with police (59%) and locked entrances (50%) were the measures cited most often. Tenant education was checked by 36%, and fencing, special staff training, and more security guards were checked by almost a fourth of the respondents.

\*New or improved

TABLE 16.

## EFFECTIVENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED

	<u>Very Effective</u>	<u>Somewhat Effective</u>	<u>Not Effective</u>	<u>Number Implementing</u>
Electronic surveillance*	67%	33%	0%	( 39 )
Window gates*	67%	33%	0%	( 42 )
Locked entrances*	60%	36%	4%	(135)
Fencing*	55%	39%	6%	( 66 )
More security guards	48%	47%	5%	( 62 )
Tenant patrols	39%	55%	5%	( 38 )
Tenant education	34%	59%	7%	( 98 )
Liaison with police	55%	38%	7%	(161)
Special staff training	55%	45%	0%	( 65 )

Base: Number implementing each item = 100%

The crime prevention measures perceived as most effective in the developments that implemented them were electronic surveillance and window gates, cited by two-thirds of those implementing as Very Effective. These measures were also among those least implemented.

Also cited frequently as Very Effective were locked entrances and fencing, liaison with police, and special staff training.

\*New or improved

### III. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM HOUSING MANAGERS

Many respondents submitted clear, constructive comments to open-ended questions. A number of them addressed similar issues, therefore, only those comments that offered a representative view of the responses to the following three questions appear below:

- A. If there is no illegal drug dealing in your development, what are the reasons?
- B. What crime prevention measures have you implemented?
- C. What measures do you recommend, or believe you need?

\* \* \*

#### A. Reasons for No Drug Problem

- 1. This is a Senior Unit, totally free of drugs, which is strictly patrolled by staff and local police.
- 2. During 1989 we worked with the Narcotics Squad and allowed them to use our roof for surveillance. This helped to keep drug dealers away.
- 3. Since a security camera was installed, there have been no incidents.
- 4. Through education, work with the police and staff training, we have removed 90% of drug activity from the project...

#### B. Crime Prevention Measures Implemented

- 1. Strengthened the lease regarding illegal drug activity.
- 2. Floodlights were installed on buildings on perimeter of property and a drug hotline was installed.
- 3. We upgraded the lighting in the portico areas of the buildings, and increased pole lamps along the pathways in the more desolate areas of the complex.
- 4. A number of tenants are prompt in reporting incidents and rumblings to management and the police. Also, there is increased involvement in the tenant patrol.
- 5. A drug hotline was installed in the management company office.

6. Through a card-access system in our garages, we have reduced the number of auto thefts and larcenies.
7. Residents must enter with a key, visitors must be buzzed in by intercom, and security guards have guests sign for the apartments they are visiting. We have secured the parking lot with heavy-duty fencing and locks. Also, tenants were issued confidential forms to report drug conditions. Security supervisors are registered NYCPD "Drug Busters."
8. Mirrors were installed on each floor of the tower buildings to permit persons exiting from the elevators to observe the corridor hallways leading to their apartments.
9. Computerized alarm systems were placed in all the laundry rooms and are centrally monitored in the security office. This system has greatly reduced the incidence of laundry room larcenies.
10. Surveillance cameras were installed for tenants to view the building lobby entrance and the laundry room 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, on their private television screens.
11. Electronic lobby entrance door locks were installed which can only be activated when the tenant presses an entry buzzer, or uses a lobby key.
12. We are doing careful screening of prospective tenants; improved lighting in all outside/public areas; and have daily routine inspections of all security equipment.
13. A "Drug Free" rally was held on our grounds for neighborhood adults and children, with music and pony rides; this resulted in excellent publicity.

C. Measures Recommended or Needed

1. Screen tenants more effectively (i.e., police record checks).
2. After-hour security would reduce drug activity during non-working hours. Also, tenant education program is needed.
3. More security personnel would reduce crime; tenants should be reminded of regulations on eviction; and management must see that these regulations are implemented.
4. Increase fulltime security guards, tenant participation, and cooperation between management and local police.

5. We need more armed security guards to complement the Housing Police, and more tenant patrols.
6. Additional vehicles and security personnel would reduce overall crime in the area.
7. More tenants should join the "neighborhood watch" to deter vandalism in our parking lots.
8. Implement a "neighborhood watch" program and increase cooperation with local police department.
9. Tenants are afraid to get involved in tenant patrols. We need tenant education programs.
10. Management must work very closely with tenant patrol volunteers.
11. Hire a housing company security director to address the drug/crime problem.
12. Onsite anti-drug coordinator is needed to provide education, counseling, liaison with police, and organize tenant patrols.
13. Increase community awareness by education and maintain a good relationship with local police.
14. Need more visible police patrols. Also extend PD's "operation interlock" program which puts onsite security in direct contact with the local precinct via radio.
15. Additional police surveillance is needed.
16. Need more policemen on foot patrol, especially during the warm season.
17. Set up a drug hotline to monitor and act on drug-related information.
18. Install better fencing around exterior of parking lot.
19. Increase lighting to eliminate all darkened areas.
20. Locked lobby doors with an intercom system would keep drug traffic out of lobbies and also encourage tenant patrols to monitor lobbies.
21. Use slam-doorlock entrances, redesign breezeways and lobbies, and increase adult tenant involvement with tenant patrol.

New York State  
Division of Housing and Community Renewal

1989 Housing Drug Survey

Part I

**Project Data Form**

**Instructions:**

1. A **Project Data Form (Part I)** and a **Questionnaire Form (Part II)** must be completed by housing managers for each State-supervised housing company development and each public housing authority development in New York State.
2. Housing managers are requested to report on conditions in their developments during the last two twelve-month periods: January 1, 1988 - December 31, 1988 and January 1, 1989 - December 31, 1989.
3. Where entries require statistical information, please give the best estimate if no precise data is available.
4. Do not skip any questions; all questions must be answered to the best of your ability.
5. A completed set of forms consisting of Part I and Part II for each development must be returned by January 31, 1990 to:

NYS Division of Housing and Community Renewal  
Housing Management Bureau  
Room E365  
1 Fordham Plaza  
Bronx, New York 10458  
Attn: Drug Survey Coordinator

All entries must be printed or typed.

Development Name and Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Development Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Street Address City, Town, Village Zip

Survey Respondent's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title and Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Survey Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

DHCR Housing Management Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide the following data for each building in this development. If a building has more than one address, list each address separately but fill in the remaining data for the entire building. Please attach a continuation sheet if necessary.

<u>Street Address</u>	<u>Number of Floors</u>	<u>Number of Dwelling Units</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	Total:	_____



New York State  
Division of Housing and Community Renewal

1989 Housing Drug Survey

Part II

Questionnaire Form

A. Please indicate type of housing:

1.  Housing Company Development      3.  Family Housing      6.  Co-op  
2.  Housing Authority Development      4.  Senior Citizen Housing      7.  Rental  
5.  Staff Housing

B. Please check size of development according to Total Number of Dwelling Units. This information must correspond to the information on the Project Data Form.

1.  1 - 300      2.  301 - 500      3.  501 - 1,000      4.  over 1,000

C. Please indicate location:

1.  Upstate  
2.  New York City Metropolitan Area

D. Do you believe there is illegal drug use anywhere in this development at this time?

1.  Yes      2.  No

E. Do you believe there is drug dealing\* anywhere in this development at this time?

1.  Yes      2.  No

F. If answer to E is "yes", how many months ago was drug dealing\* first noticed? \_\_\_\_\_

G. If there is no drug dealing\* in this development, what is the reason? (Check all that apply.)

1.  No major influx of drugs in area  
2.  Community drug prevention and education programs  
3.  Organized tenant patrol  
4.  Security guards  
5.  Security systems  
6.  Police activity  
7.  Evictions  
8.  Senior Citizen Development  
9.  Other:

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\* Dealing includes illegal sale, manufacture, or storage

H. Please provide data below for this development for the periods January 1, 1988 - December 31, 1988 and January 1, 1989 - December 31, 1989:

Item	During 1988	During 1989
1. Total number of vacancies (for all reasons)	No. _____	No. _____
2. Total number of evictions (for all reasons)	No. _____	No. _____
3. Total number of drug-related evictions (whether or not drugs formed the basis for the eviction.)	No. _____	No. _____
4. Total number of evictions for non-payment of rent	No. _____	No. _____
5. Total amount of vacated Arrears	\$ _____	\$ _____
6. Total security Personnel Costs	\$ _____	\$ _____
7. Total security equipment and/or material cost	\$ _____	\$ _____
8. Total cost of repairs in building and grounds	\$ _____	\$ _____
9. Total cost of repairs due only to vandalism and crime	\$ _____	\$ _____

I. Please indicate if, from 1988 to 1989, vandalism generally increased, decreased, or remained unchanged in this development.  
(Check all that apply.)

Vandalism Areas	There is no Vandalism	Incidence Increased	Increase Appears to be Drug-Related	Incidence Decreased	Incidence Remained Unchanged
1. <input type="checkbox"/> General Impression	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Main entry doors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment entry doors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Elevators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. <input type="checkbox"/> Security systems (intercoms, TV monitors, light bulbs etc.) Lobbies;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. <input type="checkbox"/> Hallways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. <input type="checkbox"/> Roof bulkhead doors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. <input type="checkbox"/> Parking lots; Garages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Nearby premises/grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

J. Please indicate if, from 1988 to 1989, loitering generally increased, decreased, or remained unchanged in this development. (Check all that apply.)

1.  There is no loitering
2.  Incidence Increased
3.  Increase appears to be drug related
4.  Incidence Decreased
5.  Incidence Remained Unchanged

K. This question deals with incidents of crime that may have occurred in this development during the period January 1, 1988 - December 31, 1989. For items 3 through 7, give figures including incidents that were both directly drug-related, as well as those that did not appear to be directly drug-related. If necessary, please contact your local police for assistance in obtaining this data. If you do not maintain a security or tenant report system, please enter "NA" in the applicable blank below.

Note: Column B should count each incident of a crime only once; however, if this is not attainable, give the best estimate possible.

A. Incidents in this Development	B. From Police Report	C. From Security or Tenant Report	D. Total Incidents (Figures in Columns B & C May Overlap)
1. Number of arrests for drug dealing*	_____	_____	_____
2. Number of fatalities from drug overdose	_____	_____	_____
3. Number of robberies	_____	_____	_____
4. Number of burglaries	_____	_____	_____
5. Number of assaults/violent behavior	_____	_____	_____
6. Number of arrests for illegal weapons	_____	_____	_____
7. Number of homicides	_____	_____	_____
8. Most complaints cite dealing* in the following kinds of drugs: (Check all that apply.)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Cocaine			
<input type="checkbox"/> Crack			
<input type="checkbox"/> Heroin			
<input type="checkbox"/> Marijuana			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pills			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____			

\* Dealing includes illegal sale, manufacture, or storage.

L. What specific crime-prevention programs or measures have been implemented in this development? For any that have been implemented, please indicate their effectiveness in reducing the crime rate in this development. (Check all that apply.)

	Please check if not implemented	If program was implemented, how effective is it?		
		Very effective	Somewhat effective	Not effective
1. Electronic Surveillance (new or improved)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Window Gates (new or improved)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Locked Entrances (new or improved)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Fencing (new or improved)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. More Security Guards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Tenant Patrols	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Tenant Education Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Liaison with Local Police	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Special Staff Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

M. Are there any particular measures which you believe would help to reduce the illegal drug problem and related crimes in and around this particular housing development, and/or housing developments in general? Please explain giving as much detail as possible, including examples:

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---