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For years, cities have watched the slow but continual erosion of their business bases, particularly retail business bases. From the mid-1950s and through the 1980s, more and more people moved out of cities and into suburbs. Middle-class flight from urban areas, accompanied by the proliferation of highways, spawned a dramatic change in American life. Whereas cities dominated America’s social, political and economic life in the first half of the 20th century, the second half of the century witnessed the largest shift in social, political and economic capital that the country had experienced since the Industrial Revolution.

Cities are also seen by many as the repositories of the country’s social and criminal problems. Crime, poverty, social turmoil, and social instability are most often associated with urban, not suburban America.

Middle-class flight from cities has contributed to the decline of America’s big cities. To many, the suburbs represent the 20th-century American dream – a cleaner and safer environment in which to work, play and do business.

As a result, the economic stability of major cities weakened throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s as the work force shifted and businesses looked to the suburban marketplace. In the early 1970s, New York City faced financial collapse. Since that time, nearly all large
American cities have teetered on the brink of financial ruin at some point, and public and private confidence in cities has consequently waned. In many cities, the legacy of these forces is all too apparent today—abandoned storefronts, closed businesses, and shrinking tax bases.

By contrast, suburban areas continue to grow and prosper. Suburban areas now attract a sizable proportion of manufacturing and service industries, and the suburban mall has, in many parts of the country, replaced downtown retail business districts.

Fortunately, governments and citizens now recognize the decline of America’s cities as a problem. While cities continue to struggle with economic and maintenance problems, there appears to be a renewed interest in “showcasing” cities by highlighting their historic and geographic significance. In recent years, downtown shopping malls, revitalized historic areas, and recreational opportunities have become more common in America’s cities. Economic development within cities, particularly in downtown areas, has increased. In many cities, such efforts have required that we rethink the roles of public police and private security in providing a clean and secure environment in which public and private interests can grow.

The revitalization of Philadelphia’s Center City district provides an example of collaboration between public police and private security. Philadelphia’s leaders focused on the Center City business community as the single most important component of the city’s economic viability. Center City’s businesses produce the greatest proportion of city taxes, jobs, and economic impact in Philadelphia and the metropolitan region. City leaders recognized that “as the Center City goes, so goes the rest of the city.” Such a recognition called for an alliance between government and business to re-invent Center City Philadelphia.

In 1991, Center City’s business community called for the creation of a Center City District to increase the area’s cleanliness and safety, while also marketing the area as a viable place for recreation and business opportunity. “Clean and safe” were the buzz-words for the area (Business Philadelphia, 1991). The public police and private security agencies would be primary players in the effort to make Center City “clean and safe.” Reducing fear of crime, and increasing public perception of order were also central components of this effort. As long as the public perceived the area as uninviting and fear-inducing, it would remain an abandoned area.
THE ROLE OF PUBLIC SAFETY IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HEALTH OF CITIES

A labyrinth of relationships exists between public police and private security personnel, especially in the central business districts of large cities. The public police have typically regulated social order outside of buildings, while the private police have typically regulated order within buildings or inside building complexes. The two groups interact in fundamental ways, all of which contribute to the “security net” within central business districts. In essence, the “horizontal and vertical” safety of any center city business area is greatly enhanced with cooperative public and private police arrangements.

Historically, a tension has existed between public police and private security agents. This tension has several components. First, the roles and functions of public and private police are often unclear and/or misunderstood. While the public has focused its attention on the police in recent years, there has been little public assessment of the private police, despite private policing’s exponential growth over the past decade.2

A second tension between public and private policing has been in the status accorded to each. All too often, security personnel are characterized as “Rent a Cops” (Klare, 1975a; 1975b) ill-suited, underpaid, and under-trained gatekeepers with limited and intrusive roles. By contrast, public police status has risen since the 1960s in light of efforts to create the rhetoric and reality of a “professionalized” public police service.

A third tension between the public and private police stems from their competition to provide services in a swiftly changing marketplace. Assuming that there is a “fixed” amount of public and private funds for security services, there is a certain “zero-sum” competition between public and private policing for those resources. Some argue that for each dollar spent on private security, businesses will be less willing to pay higher taxes for additional public police. Similarly, private security may suffer economic loss as public police are more diligent in specific neighborhoods or with regard to specific crime. Moreover, in many communities public police also serve as private police as businesses hire them for “off-duty” security assignments. Real or perceived, economic competition is a concern for both public and private security and safety.

In the social and political arena, competition between the public and private police is constitutionally centered (see, Shearing, 1992). That is, as the private police assume a greater role in securing public places,
issues of legal mandate, authority, and accountability arise. In a
democratic society, police are accountable to the public and subject to
certain limits. Since private agents hold little allegiance to the public, and
since they are paid to address the interests of their immediate employer,
the possibility exists for them to abuse their authority. This obviously has
implications for matters of justice, equity and fairness – essential
elements to “due process.”

Notwithstanding these important practical and theory-based
problems, public and private police are collaborating more and more. The
trend toward a more cooperative relationship between public and private
police, particularly in large urban areas, is fueled in part by their mutual
interest in securing and stabilizing the business districts of large cities.

While the private police (or at least the business interests
employing them) have long recognized the value of protecting
businesses, the public police are more and more aware of their role in
stabilizing the business climate in cities. Partnership between public and
private police is a growth industry. According to Cunningham and Taylor
(1985:163), authors of what has come to be known as the Hallcrest
Report: 3

The popular perception of private security as a fast growing
industry is certainly supported by analysis of the available data
sources. By 1985 Americans will easily spend $20 billion per
year for products and services to protect themselves - more
than they’ll spend to support all enforcement agencies (federal,
state, local) in the U.S.

Private security is big business in America and continues to grow
at a record rate as society grapples with increasing public safety and
crime concerns. In 1982, it was estimated that 640,000 people were
employed in private security. By 1990, private security employment
stood at approximately 1.5 million and this number is expected to
increase to 1.9 million by the year 2000.

By contrast, public police employment was estimated to be
580,000, rising to 623,000 in 1990, and 684,000 in 2000 (Chaiken &
Chaiken, 1987; Cunningham, Strauchs, & Van Meter, 1990). Today there
are about three private security agents for every law enforcement officer
in the U.S.

Private security employment continues to grow, while
employment within public police agencies remains stagnant or has
deprecated. This is in part due to shrinking resources at all levels of
government, as well as reduced costs for many lower-level private security services. This trend is likely to continue as businesses and individuals purchase the level of security and safety they feel they require to provide the reality and perception of safety.

The Hallcrest Report II suggested four reasons for the growth of private security: 1) increasing workplace crime; 2) increasing fear of crime; 3) decreasing rates of government spending for public protection; and 4) increasing awareness and use of private security products and services as cost-effective protective measures (Cunningham, Strauchs, and Van Meter, 1990:327).

Dissatisfaction with public police services, especially in urban areas, and the availability of customized security services tailored to a business’ or individual’s special needs ensure continued growth in the private security field. It is possible that should this trend continue, wealthy citizens and corporations will buy the protection they can afford, while the public police become little more than the police of the poor.

CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD THE COMPLEMENTARY ROLES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POLICE

Over the years, many police have held a less than favorable impression of the abilities and functions of private security personnel; some police officers hold private security agents in contempt. Likewise, private police often hold negative views of the public police as people who always come after the fact, have little accountability for crime, and who are often demeaning and highly critical of private security efforts.

Fortunately, stereotypes have begun to change, due in large measure to public police adopting new service-oriented philosophies, coupled with a greater awareness that the public police cannot stand alone in the crime-control arena. The new philosophies of policing, whether called community policing (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988), neighborhood-oriented policing (Wycoff, et al., 1985a, 1985b, 1985c), or problem-oriented policing (Eck and Spelman, 1987; Goldstein, 1990) have as their core the provision of efficient and effective service to an actively engaged community. The community’s interests and capacities for self-protection are taken into account in designing and implementing crime prevention activities.
Cooperation with private security is one strategy that public police are using to improve public safety, particularly within densely populated business communities. This cooperation enables businesses to maintain a safe work environment for employees, and assists retailers in creating a safe and pleasant environment for shoppers.

The public police have recognized that they cannot resolve urban public safety problems alone. They must become leaders in marshaling public and private resources to take a team approach to providing greater public safety.

Several factors have contributed to a greater understanding by the public police of the proper role of private security: 1) a perception of increasing professionalism within private security organizations; 2) a greater awareness and appreciation of the problems confronted in providing security services; and 3) a recognition that “cost sharing” may be the only way to increase security services within the business community.

Finally, successful collaborations between public police and private security help promote future cooperation. Each successful contact establishes further ties and acts as a building block for increased communication and joint programs.

THE PHILADELPHIA CENTER CITY DISTRICT

Philadelphia, a city of 1.6 million with millions more in the surrounding metropolitan area, has a concentrated center city that is in many ways akin to a European city, rather than the decentralized expanses of many American cities. Philadelphia’s historic areas, adjacent to or within the business district, are distinctive, featuring narrow cobblestone streets, densely packed buildings, and narrow walkways. On the eastern boundary of the business district is a “Liberty Mall,” the Liberty Bell, and Independence Hall, the birthplace of the American colonies. The area attracts millions of visitors annually. Further within the business district is an eclectic mixture of old-world buildings rehabilitated into office complexes, urban malls, business streetscapes, and modern skyscrapers dominating the city’s skyline. And, central to the business district is the recently completed of a new “convention center” and adjacent hotels, also expected to attract millions of visitors annually.

Within the Philadelphia Police Department’s Central Police Division, the police administrative area responsible for Center City
Philadelphia, are numerous corporate and government headquarters, major historical attractions, entertainment areas, twenty major hotels, two large shopping malls, hundreds of smaller retailers, 120 financial institutions, and the port of Philadelphia (Zappile, 1991:22).

In the fall of 1989, a group of business leaders known as the Central Philadelphia Development Corporation (CPDC) released a report calling for the establishment of a special services district within Center City Philadelphia. Concerned that crime, disorder, and trash-strewn streets and sidewalks were making Center City Philadelphia inhospitable, this group urged the city to support the creation of a municipal authority, later named the Center City District, to create a safe, clean, and well-managed area within an 80-block core of Center City Philadelphia.

The authority was meant to supplement, not replace, existing city services. Property owners agreed to levy an additional property tax on themselves, amounting to 4.5 percent of the current real estate tax on those properties. In 1991, this tax produced slightly over $6 million for the implementation of the Center City District and the expansion of safety and sanitation services. It is estimated that by 1995, revenue from this levy will exceed $8 million.

As indicated in the call for this municipal authority, the Center City area is a significant contributor to the economic and social well-being of Philadelphia. The Special Services District “Feasibility Report” (1990:4-5) determined that

- Center City generates $355 million, or more than 33 percent, of the city’s total tax revenues. Yet it receives $120 million in services and programs, or 12 percent of annual city expenditures. Center City is a net exporter of revenue to the city’s neighborhoods.

- Center City’s 9,790 private and public organizations employ 285,560 people; account for over $400 million in property, wage and business taxes; and generate $20 billion annually in economic activity, based upon 1984 statistics. The majority (55%) of employment is located in offices. Finance, real estate, professional and technical information-based services, and government account for the majority of core employment.

- The largest percentage (38%) of all Center City jobs are in services, half of which are in offices. This sector has grown by 23 percent since 1970. Three service industries have grown most
rapidly: education (+82%), health care (+47%) and legal services (+30%).

- Over one-half of the region’s non-profit cultural institutions – 85 organizations – are located in Center City: 35 percent are performing arts organizations; 34 percent are visual arts organizations; 20 percent are educational institutions and community centers; and 11 percent are libraries, research institutes, and historical societies.

- An estimated 208,000 people visit Center City on any given day. About 4.5 million visit Center City from outside the region each year.

Further analysis produced by the CPDC indicated that business people and local residents were dissatisfied with public services provided to Center City Philadelphia, particularly public safety and sanitation services. The quality of life in Center City Philadelphia was perceived as poor. Businesses had been leaving the city for years and workers rushed to and from the city, ever concerned that they would be victimized. Those external to the city, and indeed, city residents themselves, had concluded that Center City was unsafe. It had the signs of crime; it was unkempt, poorly maintained and felt unsafe.

Patronage of the entertainment businesses within Center City was on the decline, in part due to perceptions of the unsafe atmosphere in Center City. For all purposes Center City had been abandoned; it was home to businesses in the daylight hours, the disenfranchised, and criminals at other times.

Part of the call for a Center City District also stemmed from the fragmentation of police and sanitation services to that area. Historically, the Center City of Philadelphia had been split between two police districts. And, while the Center City was within the administrative oversight of the Central Police Division Inspector, many in the business community felt that targeted responses to crime and disorder problems in Center City were complicated by the administrative division of the Center City area between two police commands. Similarly the sanitation district encompassing the Center City area was also responsible for a vast residential area surrounding the business districts, precluding the effective targeting of sanitation services.
Central Police Division statistics of calls for police services revealed that in 1989, 37 percent of all calls for service and committed patrol response workload occurred within the boundaries of the proposed Center City District, the remainder being distributed across residential areas within the Central Police Division. Moreover, controlling for call priority (seriousness of the incident prompting the call) 51 percent of the highest priority, and 42 percent of the second highest priority calls for police assistance occurred within the area proposed for the Center City District. This indicated that, while the Center City area accounted for slightly over one-third of all police activity, the activity occurring in the Center City area was more often of a highly serious or serious nature. Corroborating this conclusion, police statistics revealed that 54 percent of all arrests made in the Central Police Division occurred within the area of the proposed Center City District.6

Similar analyses of police workload, calls for service, arrests, and crime in the two police districts splitting the Center City area produced consistent results to those for the police division as a whole. That is, the Center City area consistently consumed slightly over one-third of both districts’ resources and manpower, and produced greater arrests than did the more residential areas contained within those police districts.

This analysis also found that the 6th and 9th Police Districts (those districts splitting the Center City area) were ranked 5th and 10th respectively in the total volume of police assistance (calls for service) among the 23 police districts of the Philadelphia Police Department. This data lent further support to a targeted police response for the area.

With such evidence of demand and call seriousness within Center City Philadelphia, the Center City District was implemented in 1990 to increase security, improve the physical maintenance of the area, and market Center City Philadelphia as a place to work and recreate. The Center City District’s structure includes a small central administration, a private street-cleaning subcontractor, community service representatives who serve in a joint role of increasing security and being public ambassadors, and a police substation with 57 foot patrol officers.

While all of the functions of the Center City District ultimately contribute to public safety, the combination of the police and community service representatives has most directly affected crime and disorder problems. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that the over 100 sidewalk cleaners, and the system to power wash and sweep sidewalks throughout the Center City District have had a powerful effect on perceptions of cleanliness within the district.
Moreover, as will be discussed below, the partnerships among
the community service representatives, the Philadelphia Police and the
sanitation crews is an important vehicle for maintaining the perception
and reality of greater social order within the Center City District.

A case study of private/public cooperation is offered in the
analysis of Philadelphia’s Center City District. From its inception, the
Center City District has envisioned a greater interdependency among the
Philadelphia police, a cadre of “community service representatives” and
private security agents. This project has become a model for other cities,
and illustrates the benefits of cooperative relationships that might be
achieved between the public and the private police.

The Center City District Concept

For many years criminologists and social scientists have
recognized that crime and fear of crime stem from individuals’
assessments of the physical areas in which they find themselves, the
visibility of “signs of crime,” and the presence of a visible police or
security presence. The Center City District is designed around the
premise that cleaning and surveilling the 80 blocks within Center City
Philadelphia will reduce the “signs of crime” perceived by regulars and
visitors to the area, increase the perception of greater surveillance of
public places, and reduce actual victimization within the area. This
premise is the foundation for Center City District activities.

From a station house located within the Center City District, a
cadre of sweepers, community service representatives and Philadelphia
police officers patrol the area. The sweepers and the community service
representatives wear a distinctive uniform, quite recognizable to those
on the street. And while there are some 50 community service
representatives, it is believed that the added presence of over 100
uniformed sweepers also increases the public perception of surveillance
of the area.

The Center City District includes communications and planning
personnel who direct the responses of all members of the Center City
District. These coordinative roles also include marketing the Center
City District through, among other things, the placement of large,
colorful Center City banners, and a campaign to attract people to come
to Center City and “Make it a Night.” Taken together, these efforts have
begun the process of revitalizing the central business district in
Philadelphia.
Community Service Representatives

As previously indicated, the community service representatives are distinctively uniformed private-sector employees who function as public concierges and a paid town watch within the Center City District. They carry radios and first-aid equipment, along with information regarding the many attractions within and around Philadelphia. They act as goodwill ambassadors, and as the “eyes and ears” of the police. Representatives undergo a rigorous selection process, followed by an extensive 10-week formal training process. Philadelphia police officers conduct some of the training, and it is during this training that public police and private security make their initial contact.

Community service representatives were recruited from throughout the community, using job fairs and newspaper announcements. They are not typical of the security industry; 32 percent are women, 90 percent had at least some college, with 31 percent having bachelors degrees; and they range in age from 21 to 65. Community service representatives are also paid well in comparison to traditional security personnel. Each community service representative’s performance is measured in contacts: casual (one minute or less), extended (1-3 minutes), and significant (over 10 minutes). In 1991 and 1992, the community service representatives reported 770,000 casual contacts, 83,800 extended contacts, and 3,200 significant contacts.

The Center City Substation

The Central Police Division supplies all police services to Center City Philadelphia. The division, commanded by an inspector, is further divided into two geographical patrol districts and a detective division, each commanded by a captain. Over 400 police personnel make up the division.

The Center City substation is located within the offices of the Center City District administration. The police detail assigned to the Center City District, composed of police officers from both the 6th and 9th Police Districts, is commanded by a lieutenant with four sergeants and 57 patrol officers most of whom patrol on foot. Since the area serviced by the substation is an overlay of the two patrol districts, the lieutenant answers directly to the divisional inspector, thereby increasing the coordination of all police activities within the area. The foot patrol
officers supplement, but do not replace, the existing motorized patrol assigned to the area.

**A Unique Collaboration**

The daily operation of the Center City District is a creative collaboration between public police and private security. The groups share office space and occupy common locker facilities. The day and evening shifts hold joint roll calls addressed by police and community service representative supervisors. Police supervisors carry both police and community service representative radios, and any community service representative can contact police operations in the substation via radio.

Supervisors of both groups facilitate the flow of information and cooperation between their charges. This is aided by the director of the community service representatives being a former police inspector. Community service representatives ride along with police supervisors to get the flavor of police work, while police officers are encouraged to exchange information with patrolling community service representatives. Patrol officers and detectives regularly discuss crime conditions and crime prevention strategies with community service representatives.

A computer mapping project with equipment and support provided by the Center City District is well under way. This will enable the Center City District and the Central Police Division to share up-to-date crime information and other statistical information on the center city area, including business occupancy patterns, information derived from satisfaction and use surveys, and the conditions and concentration of homeless people in the area.

Impact teams consisting of police officers, community service representatives, and sanitation personnel have been formed to address specific public safety conditions within defined geographical areas. These are important problem-solving exercises in which the personnel involved learn that the problems of the center city are multi-dimensional. Clean streets contribute to the goal of safe streets, and the conditions of homeless people and the small incivilities of urban life contribute to the overall perception and fear of crime.

The impact teams address these problems with a multi-faceted, unified approach. A good example of this unified approach is the “Wednesday Night Out” program developed by the Center City District to address retailers’ ability to attract customers in the evening. The Center City District administration convinced retailers to extend their business
hours on Wednesday evening and developed a series of promotions and a media blitz to convince people to stay in the city on Wednesday evening to shop, dine and be entertained, rather than just go home to the suburbs or other parts of the city at the end of the workday.

Downtown businesses created an atmosphere emphasizing entertainment and festivity. On downtown streets, musical groups and other street performers entertained restaurant and retail shop patrons. The police and community service representatives coordinated scheduling and deployment to have the maximum number of personnel on the street and increase the visibility of safety personnel. Furthermore, community service representatives provided nighttime visitors with information and directions to the many events in the area, and the special promotions advertised by retailers and restaurants. Businesses experienced a significant increase in customer traffic during the campaign, and the program’s initial success will lead to its repeat.

The Center City District has also generated ideas for many other innovative collaborations among the police, private security and business. One example is the institution of a police bicycle patrol equipped through private donations. Another is the acquisition of cellular telephones by businesses for the foot patrol officers who cover the “Jewelers Row” section of Center City, an area almost entirely devoted to jewelry sales. When investigating burglar alarms the officers are able to talk via the phones directly to the alarm companies and the business owners.

**THE PRELIMINARY IMPACT OF THE CENTER CITY DISTRICT**

While it may be premature to evaluate the long-term effects of the public/private police collaboration in this project, statistical evidence points to the impact the project is having on certain types of crime in the district. These data are collected regularly by the Center City District in conjunction with the police department’s normal crime reporting efforts.

Between January 1992 and January 1993, reported assaultive crime in the Center City District declined significantly (in the range of 50%), while some property crime classes increased, most notably theft. In regard to robbery and aggravated assault, two public-place assaultive crimes, these preliminary results are encouraging, but certainly not
definitive. Nevertheless, such preliminary results can bolster efforts to expand and improve the Center City District’s efforts.

Further, the success of the Center City District and its contingent of police personnel may, in the short-run, produce greater crime reporting, similar to the experiences of mini-stations across the country.

Also yet to be assessed is the “rate of crime” for the District. That is to say that simple crime counts do not adequately measure crime risk in the district. In residential neighborhoods, risk is calculated by counting the number of residents and/or households, and then dividing crime frequencies according to the residency or household base of the neighborhood – a base that is rather constant. In Center City with over 300,000 daily workers, millions of visitors, and the influx of a high volume of vehicles, estimates of the appropriate base for determining risk will need to be refined. Base considerations must be adjusted by time and day, unlike in residential settings. And bases will need adjustment in light of convention activity brought to the Center City District by the planned convention center.

THE FUTURE OF PHILADELPHIA’S COLLABORATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POLICE

The effects of merging public police and private security in the Center City District are demonstrated, in part, by the overall reduction in the incidence of crime identified above. Furthermore, the physical condition of center city streets has been publicly recognized as vastly improving.

More importantly, the collaboration between public and private police is likely to change the mix of safety services in Center City and elsewhere in Philadelphia. Current successes will likely breed more innovation. Two significant projects, likely to contribute to collaboration between public and private police, include preparations for the opening of a new convention center in Philadelphia, and the development of a new strategy for addressing homelessness within Center City.

A huge new convention center opened in the summer 1993 in the Center City District area. The convention center is expected to have dramatic impact in Center City Philadelphia with the building of new hotels, restaurants, and retail stores. The city has announced its intention
to become one of the premier convention and tourist locations in the country.

The Central Police Division has already started to establish a mini-station in the convention center itself. The community service representatives are planning to operate from this facility, along with personnel from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. Close cooperation is planned with other private security personnel who will be headquartered adjacent to the police facility within the new convention center. This police substation will become the center of planning and operations for the convention center and the surrounding area.

The impending opening of the convention center has focused greater attention on homeless people in Philadelphia. As in other large cities in the United States, hundreds of homeless people congregate in the central business district. Many engage in aggressive panhandling and commit property crimes in the center city area. Others suffering from psychological and/or drug and alcohol problems are a disruptive influence in the business district, often sleeping in doorways and otherwise obstructing the flow of pedestrian traffic. Their presence influences crime and the perception of crime and disorder.

The administration of the Center City District has been one of several entities focusing public and governmental attention on homeless people, defining the problem, and suggesting solutions. They are helping to coordinate the resources of the public and private sectors.

The police realize that law enforcement is but a small part of a successful strategy to address homelessness. The experience with the Center City District has demonstrated that the solution to safety and security problems created by large numbers of homeless people lies in a coordinated effort with private security, business, and other public and private homeless assistance service providers. An outgrowth of the Center City District, then, may be the development of a city-wide policy and programs focused at creatively and humanely addressing homelessness in Philadelphia.

CONCLUSION

The collaboration of public police and private security in the Center City District has been much more than an effective cooperative program designed to provide increased public safety in a small area of Philadelphia. It has changed the paradigm of public safety for many
commanders and supervisors in the police department, while serving as a model for innovation and the application of problem-solving policing techniques to social control and criminal problems.

Each innovation fashioned by the Center City District – joint training, information sharing, computerized map information, impact teams, bike patrols, Wednesday night out – sent signals through the community and the department that cooperation with private security was beneficial and encouraged. Police commanders are learning that public safety is a complex matrix involving many public and private stakeholders. The experience with the Center City District has demonstrated that cooperation and collaboration between the public police and private security can be beneficial to public safety.

NOTES

1. There is much extant research in residential and business settings which examines the role that the physical environment plays in inspiring or reducing fear of crime and victimization. For an overview of this literature see; Reiss (1985); Rosenbaum (1986), Skogan (1990).

2. There have been several studies of private policing beginning in the 1970s. See, for example, Kakalik and Wildhorn (1972), five volumes; Cunningham and Taylor, (1985); and Chaiken and Chaiken (1987).

3. In the mid-1980s the Hallcrest Corporation was contracted by the U.S. Department of Justice to update an earlier report on the state of private policing conducted by the Rand Corporation (1972).

4. In the original discussion for implementing a Special Services District in Center City there was some support for the creation of a coterminous police district for the area. This would have increased the number of police districts in Philadelphia from 23 to 24. Ultimately, a decision was made to deploy police differently within the Center City area, in conjunction with the Center City District and not to redistrict the area.

5. The sanitation area encompassing the Center City area was at least three times as large as the central business area. This created
the perception, and often the reality, that the interests of the
business community for cleaner sidewalks and streets were pitted
against the interests of neighborhoods who might be more
concerned with trash collection and the clean-up of vacant lots.

6. These figures are somewhat complicated by arrests for
shoplifting, a crime expected to occur more often in retail
business districts such as those represented in the Center City
District.

7. This figure includes the following crime categories;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 1992</th>
<th>Jan 1993</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft (not retail)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>+32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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