

Service Efforts and Accomplishments Public Safety FY05

April 2006

The Table of Contents links to different sections of the document.

To go to a particular section or page:

- a) Place the cursor over the line that contains the section heading.
- b) Wait until the open hand symbol changes to pointer .
- c) Click once to activate link

To return to Table of Contents use [Back to Table of Contents](#) buttons at the beginning of each section.



Suzanne Flynn
Multnomah County Auditor



SUZANNE FLYNN, Auditor
Multnomah County
501 SE Hawthorne, Room 601
Portland, Oregon 97214

Telephone (503) 988-3320
Telefax (503) 988-3019

www.multnomah.or.us/auditor

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 20, 2006

To: Diane Linn, Multnomah County Chair
Maria Rojo de Steffey, Commissioner, District 1
Serena Cruz Walsh, Commissioner, District 2
Lisa Naito, Commissioner, District 3
Lonnie Roberts, Commissioner, District 4
Bernie Giusto, Sheriff
Michael Schrunk, District Attorney

From: Suzanne Flynn, County Auditor

Subject: 6th Annual Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report
Public Safety Services FY05

I am pleased to share our 6th annual Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report. The purpose of this report is to increase government accountability and to provide information to citizens about their government.

This report continues to evolve. Beginning last year this report was redesigned to meet updated government auditing standards and we added data verification to our work plan. This year the report has been redesigned in a continuing effort to become truly a report to citizens.

I sincerely appreciate the assistance and cooperation that we received from the District Attorney, Sheriff, and Director of the Department of Community Justice. Without them, and their staff, this report would have been impossible to complete.

Audit Team: Judith DeVilliers, LaVonne Griffin-Valade, Janis Koch and Sarah Landis

Page Intentionally Blank

Table of contents

Service Efforts and Accomplishments Public Safety Services FY06

SEA Summary	5	District Attorney	19
Introduction	6	Sheriff	25
Public Safety Overview.....	9	Citizen Survey Results	31
Community Justice	11		

The Table of Contents links to different sections of the document.

To go to a particular section or page:

- a) Place the cursor over the line that contains the section heading.
- b) Wait until the open hand  symbol changes to pointer .
- c) Click once to activate link

To return to Table of Contents use [Back to Table of Contents](#) buttons at the beginning of each section.

Page Intentionally Blank

SEA Summary Public Safety System

One of the County's priorities is that residents feel safe at home, school, work, and play. In FY05 the County spent \$193.5 million on public safety services towards that priority. Highlights of the past five years are:

- **Residents are feeling less safe than they did five years ago.** Mid-county respondents feel significantly less safe than those in other areas of the county.
- **Spending has remained fairly stable but public safety staffing has decreased.** Both the Department of Community Justice and the Sheriff's Office decreased staffing by about the equivalent of 100 full-time employees each in the last five years.
- **The crime rate has decreased in the last five years overall although it increased until 2003.**
- **The number of cases of adults prosecuted has remained almost constant in the last five years.**
- **The percent of offenses cleared by an arrest in the Sheriff's patrol areas has increased.**
- **The average number of jail beds for adults has declined from 2,072 in FY01 to 1,581 in FY05.**
- **The cost per bed day in juvenile detention has decreased 7.6%.**
- **The recidivism rate for adult offenders has declined in the last three years for both probation and post-prison supervision.** The recidivism rate for juveniles has remained between 36% and 38%.
- **The average cost per adult offender per day supervised has increased.** Department of Community Justice believes this is caused by budget reductions and the resulting shift of the workload to supervising only the higher risk offenders which require more supervision.

Introduction

Purpose

This Service Efforts and Accomplishments (SEA) report presents the resources, workloads, and results of Multnomah County’s public safety services. The Auditor’s Office reports this information in order to:

- Increase government accountability
- Provide information to citizens about their government

Implementation of SEA Reporting

In FY00, the Auditor’s Office studied the possibility of SEA reporting in Multnomah County and concluded that such reporting was feasible given the considerable progress the County had already made in performance measurement. The study identified gaps in the current performance measurement system that would be filled with SEA reporting, identified the role of the Auditor’s Office, and recognized the need for citizen engagement in performance reporting. Beginning in FY01, we began a schedule for SEA reporting that rotates between social and health services one year, and public safety the next.

Social and Health Services	Public Safety Services
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of County Human Services• Health Department• Library• Department of School and Community Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Community Justice• District Attorney’s Office• Sheriff’s Office

This year, the FY05 report contains information on the public safety services provided by the Department of Community Justice, the District Attorney’s Office, and the Sheriff’s Office.

Methodology and Scope

Service Efforts and Accomplishments reporting is a concept developed by the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB). It is intended to supplement financial reporting to give a full account of government performance. Current GASB standards do not require state and local governments to report on service efforts and accomplishments; however, GASB is considering the adoption of standards and has already established guidelines for SEA reporting. In producing this report, we followed GASB’s guidelines as well as the generally accepted government auditing standards.

The Multnomah County Auditor’s Office worked closely with staff and management in each department or agency to develop a framework for reporting, decide on measures, and gather data for the report. The reporting framework and performance measures reflect the mission, goals, and service priorities of each department.

To the extent possible, we tailored the report to reflect our learning on citizen interest. During our feasibility study, we conducted a number of focus groups to find out what citizens want to see in a performance report. The following elements were the most common:

- *Report from the public's point of view.* Organize the information by function rather than department. Include services, regardless of size, which are of great interest to the public.
- *Describe goals and service populations.*
- *Show revenues, expenditures, and the amount of services purchased.* Include information on County spending priorities and the number of people served.
- *Include broad measures.* Provide figures on County progress toward state and local benchmarks and cross-departmental measures.
- *Show efficiency measures.* Include information at the County and department level on per capita costs of services.
- *Include trends and comparisons.* Show how the County has done over time and compared to other jurisdictions.

Results are presented by department or agency. Within each, services are broken down by function or major service area. Four types of measures are provided:

1. *Spending and staffing measures* show how much each department spent, how many people it employed, and how much growth it experienced over the last five years.
2. *Workload measures* indicate how much of a service was produced or how many people were served.
3. *Outcome measures* demonstrate the intended results and effectiveness of a service or program.
4. *Efficiency and cost measures* show how much it costs to provide a service or how economically it is being provided over the course of time or compared to other jurisdictions.

Citizen Survey. In late spring 2001, the Auditor's Office conducted the first independent citizen survey to add citizen satisfaction information to the annual SEA report. The survey was designed to get information on citizen satisfaction with the quality of services and overall feelings about neighborhood livability.

Many of the services that the County provides are for specific populations and a citizen survey would not be the best method of measuring satisfaction. However, these services are also provided to help protect the general social, economic, and physical health of the larger community. Trending measures of the community's health provides some indication of how County government contributes to the feelings of regional and neighborhood livability.

The Multnomah County Auditor's Office contracted with the Portland State University Survey Research Laboratory to conduct a telephone survey of residents from randomly selected households in Multnomah County. Adults, age 18 or older, from six service districts were interviewed by telephone in the spring of 2005. Of the 3,124 households with whom contact was made, 1,602 completed the interview, and 1,528 refused to be interviewed. This yields a response rate of 51%. The results of this survey are reported in the Citizen Survey section of the report.

Data and Measure Limitations

Performance measures, such as those presented in this report, provide good indicators of accomplishments or changes in performance. They do not tell us why a program is succeeding or failing. We did not attempt to determine the causes behind specific performance trends; such a task would require extensive evaluation work that is beyond the scope of this report. We encourage readers to consider SEA information in this light. Program staff, County management, or elected officials may be contacted for more information about the results presented here.

Public Safety services are provided to help protect citizens by intervening when a crime has occurred and preventing new crime by changing behavior. Outcomes for these activities are difficult to measure: results can take years to emerge, causal factors are hard to isolate, privacy and cost issues curtail data collection efforts, and clients are very difficult to track over time. Given these limitations, we have provided measures that show performance in specific programs or among certain populations. We were able to show results on community-wide benchmarks, such as crime rate, but were not able to evaluate whether specific County programs impacted these results.

Most of the data in the report were provided to the Auditor's Office by department staff and were collected internally, from contractors, or from another government such as the State of Oregon. Due to time and resource constraints, not all data could be verified for accuracy by the Auditor's Office. However, we have begun to verify a few high-level outcome measures in each department each year. Many of these measures we reviewed share data sources with other measures, so we were able to, in effect, review multiple measures in one process. We have provided information on the results of our data verification directly to departments and made recommendations for improvements when indicated.

Our goal is to make the SEA report as accessible and meaningful to the citizens of Multnomah County as possible while accurately reflecting the work of the County and meeting GASB's guidelines. We will continue to work with departments to develop, implement, and report on SEA, focusing next year on the County's social and health services.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the staff in each department or agency who worked so hard to put this report together, and to department director Joanne Fuller of Community Justice, District Attorney Mike Schrunk and Sheriff Bernie Giusto, for giving staff the time to work on this project.


Community Justice: Charlene Rhyne and Kim Pascual

District Attorney: John Bradley, Leah Ivey, Karl Kosydar, Helen O'Brien, Eric Schafer, Helen Smith and Jo'ey Stewart

Sheriff: Wendy Lin-Kelly


Multnomah County GIS

Overview of the Public Safety System



In Multnomah County, three agencies have responsibility for portions of the public safety system: the District Attorney’s Office prosecutes criminal cases, the Sheriff’s Office runs local jails and polices in unincorporated portions of the County, and the Department of Community Justice supervises offenders who are released into the community on probation or post-prison supervision. Each of these agencies also provides a number of other services that help prevent crime, reduce the likelihood of further criminal activity, and support victims of crime. The County also supports the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council, whose job it is to bring together agencies that work in public safety to assure that policies and programs work smoothly across jurisdictional lines.


- The County spent approximately \$193.5 million on public safety services in the three agencies in FY05.
- Personnel costs for these agencies in FY05 were \$134.6 million, with the equivalent of 1,579 full time employees.




Highlights of the Public Safety System

- The crime rate of Part I crimes decreased between 2003 and the first half of 2005 after an increase over years prior. Part I crimes are: murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, vehicle theft, and arson. Other crimes, including DUII crimes, are not reported here.
- The adult recidivism rate (convicted of a new felony crime in the three year period after supervision begins) has declined over the past three years for both probation and post-prison supervision. Probationers are those who have been assigned supervision as a sanction for their offenses rather than going to jail. Parole/post-prison supervision refers to those offenders who are conditionally released from prison.
- The recidivism rate (commission of new criminal offense within one year of their initial offense) for juveniles has been between 36% and 38% for the most current five-year period available.


Crime Rate (Part 1) per 1,000 residents
(Portland and Gresham Only)



Adult Offenders Recidivism Rates



Juvenile Offenders Recidivism Rates



Department of Community Justice

Accomplishments FY05



- Recidivism continued to decline.
- Improved ability to identify and respond to risk of violence by adult offenders.
- Established a predatory sex offender web page.
- Disproportionate commitment of minority youth to correctional facilities continued to decline.
- Youth successfully completing drug abuse and mental health treatment programs increased.
- Increased adult offender fee collection.
- Continued implementing research-supported practices despite resource decline.

Issues FY05

- Uncertain fiscal environment with reduced funding.
- Loss of the Forest Project, an alternative to jail and youth detention.
- Loss of secure alcohol and drug abuse treatment for high-risk adult offenders.
- Loss of resources to address delinquency of low-risk juveniles.

The Department of Community Justice (DCJ) works to keep communities safe and to reduce criminal recidivism by holding offenders accountable and helping them develop skills for success in the community.

- DCJ spent \$75 million on services in FY05, an increase of 1% over FY01.
- \$109 was spent per county resident.
- Approximately 59% of funding came from local sources.
- DCJ employed the equivalent of 556 full-time employees in FY05.
- Staffing decreased 19.3% from FY01.
- In FY05, 55% of DCJ's spending was for personnel.




Supervision and Sanctions


DCJ supervises juvenile and adult offenders in the community. Adult offenders are either on probation (sentenced to supervision in the community rather than going to jail) or on parole/post-prison supervision (conditional release from prison). Staff assess offenders' risk to the community, impose sanctions when they don't comply, and make arrests when they threaten public safety. For juveniles, DCJ manages the regional detention center, community alternatives to detention, and secure treatment for juvenile sex offenders and those affected by alcohol and drug problems. It also runs programs for youth and adults that hold offenders accountable, such as community service, restitution, and day reporting.

- Approximately 9,100 adult offenders were supervised per month in FY05, a drop of 14% over five years. The number of paroled offenders rose between FY02 and FY04 as the number on probation fell.
- There were about 585 youth on probation at any given time in FY05, down 17% over five years.
- The percent of positive case closures has been falling for youth and adult probation, and is rising slightly for parole/post-prison supervision. A positive case closure is one in which the offender has fulfilled the terms of his or her probation or parole orders, or whose sentence expires without having been revoked or extended for violations.
- In FY05, the average cost per adult offender per day supervised was \$9.83, up from previous years. DCJ stated this increase in cost is the result of budget reductions which caused the department's workload to shift to more serious offenders who require a higher level of service.
- The cost per bed day in juvenile detention in FY05 was \$268, down 7.6% over four years.


Average Number Supervised per Month



Positive Supervision Case Closures





Cost per Adult Offender Supervised per Day (adjusted for inflation)



Prevention and Intervention

DCJ provides services that help prevent crime and future criminal behavior. Staff work with at-risk families to help youth steer away from delinquent behavior and to intervene early with those already involved with juvenile court. They also help adults who are transitioning out of jail and prison so as to minimize the risk to the community and improve their chances of successful reintegration. This includes assistance with education, employment, housing, and basic needs.



- The number of adults receiving services to prevent criminal behavior has grown over the past few years, particularly in drug and alcohol treatment services.
- Transitional services are also available to clients in the form of transitional housing, bus tickets, work supplies, clothing, identification, and other assistance. Approximately 7,580 transitional “service units” were provided in FY05 and 981 clients were placed in transitional housing.
- The number of juvenile clients receiving services through the skill development and informal intervention (formerly called diversion) programs has dropped in the last few years because of budget reductions. Outcomes associated with informal intervention/diversion are very positive, with a low recidivism rate (22% in FY05) and high positive case closure rate (83% in FY05).



Treatment and Rehabilitation

DCJ treats underlying problems that contribute to criminal behavior, including alcohol and drug addiction, mental health needs, and problems with anger. It also provides specialized supervision to offenders with gang affiliations, multiple substance and mental health problems, and those convicted of drunk driving, domestic violence, and sex abuse. These services are delivered by contractors in community-based settings and in detention for those offenders who require a more secure setting for treatment.

- The success rate for adult alcohol and drug treatment has consistently been higher for residential than for outpatient treatment. This could be due to several factors. Residential treatment is a more secure environment. A stable living situation is necessary to maintain regular attendance at a treatment program which may be hard for offenders to sustain during the course of outpatient treatment.
- The success rate for juvenile treatment services has been high over the last five years, generally between 60%-80%. The number of youth served in these specialized programs is relatively small, at 115 in FY05.



Department of Community Justice Data Tables
Supervision and Sanctions

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Juvenile					
Intakes at the youth detention center	5,572	4,006	3,060	3,053	2,977
Admissions to the youth detention center	2,816	2,611	2,357	2,207	2,161
Average days in youth detention (excluding Ballot Measure 11 youth)	9	10	10	10	9
Average days in youth detention for Ballot Measure 11 youth	67	46	68	59	53
Participants in accountability programs					
Forest Project	647	544	510	Program Ended	
Project Payback (restitution)	1,354	1,337	1,292	289	314
Community Service	1,601	1,464	1,110	300	299
Day Reporting	New Program	626	422	Program Ended	
Weekend Program	New Program			239	113
Adult					
Average time spent on probation (in months)		29	30	33	37
Average time spent on parole/post-prison supervision		28	29	31	31
Sanctions imposed for violations of supervision	5,501	5,435	4,362	6,120	5,736
Recognizance interviews conducted			15,674	15,905	16,096
Pretrial release clients supervised	No Data Available				
Participants in accountability programs					
Forest Project	512	481	378	Program Ended	
Community Service	4,939	4,837	4,734	2,630	1,834
Day Reporting Center	553	739	702	726	669
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Juvenile					
Juvenile offenders recidivism rate	37% (1999)	38% (2000)	39% (2001)	36% (2002)	37% (2003)
Youth in custody who increase knowledge of skills that prevent future criminal activity	83%	81%	71%	No data	No data
Community service hours completed	9,606	10,117	7,672	6,733	5,531
Total restitution paid	\$70,757	\$78,874	\$80,423	\$94,915	\$67,965
Youth who report respectful treatment by probation counselors	95%	85%	No data	96%	90%
Youth who report respectful treatment by detention staff	79%	97%	95%	No data	93%
Youth probation positive supervision case closures	76%	79%	77%	76%	71%
Average cost per bed day in detention (excludes treatment programs, adjusted for inflation)	No data	\$290.59	\$311.23	\$287.37	\$268.37

Department of Community Justice Data Tables
Supervision and Sanctions - continued

Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
<i>Adult</i>					
Adult probation recidivism rate	28%	27%	26%	24%	
Adult parole/post-prison supervision recidivism rate	31%	32%	33%	30%	
Pretrial supervision clients who fail to appear for court	17%	18%	19%	26%	25%
Community service hours completed	117,890	127,439	122,391	109,349	91,886
Percent of sanctions that are non-jail	36%	35%	30%	57%	55%
Total restitution paid	No data	\$1,234,088	\$1,283,351	\$1,360,949	\$1,309,333
Adult probation positive case closures	67%	68%	67%	61%	
Adult parole/post-prison positive case closures	56%	57%	58%	58%	
Average cost per person per day on adult supervision (excluding treatment programs, adjusted for inflation)	No data	\$9.66	\$9.15	\$9.18	\$9.83

Prevention and Intervention

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
<i>Juvenile</i>					
Youth participating in delinquency prevention (diversion/informal intervention programs)	1,375	1,185	673	300	451
Families participating in mediation and custody evaluation services	1,507	1,391	1,214	1,359	1,260
Youth and families participating in skill development programs	No data	368	175	13	53
<i>Adult</i>					
Service episodes for transitional services (bus tickets, ID, clothing, work supplies, etc.)	No data			7,400	7,579
Service episodes for special needs clients receiving additional transitional services (case management, housing placement, medical assistance, etc.)	No data			3,261	3,417
Adults participating in educational classes	531	567	596	554	630
Inmates contacted prior to release from prison		209	633	726	872
Hours of GED study provided		3,473	3,936	3,393	2,721
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
<i>Juvenile</i>					
Recidivism rate for diversion/informal intervention programs	19% (1999)	21% (2000)	18% (2001)	18% (2002)	22% (2003)
Positive case closures for diversion/informal intervention	82%	81%	82%	83%	83%
Youth reporting improved school attendance while on probation	63%	61%	No data	46%	36%
Satisfaction with custody, parenting, and mediation services	New survey			68%	59%
<i>Adult</i>					
Clients placed in contracted transitional housing	1,061	938	1,027	940	981
Clients earning GED	66	95	73	50	99

Department of Community Justice Data Tables

Treatment and Rehabilitation

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
<i>Juvenile</i>					
Youth served in secure alcohol and drug treatment	19	53	53	34	48
Youth served in secure sex offender treatment	29	49	28	33	35
Youth served in home-based family treatment		46	52	50	32
<i>Adult</i>					
Residential alcohol and drug treatment episodes		602	685	782	887
Outpatient alcohol and drug treatment episodes		1,408	1,595	1,577	1,695
Alcohol and drug treatment episodes for drug court		1,001	1,205	1,104	775
Mental health treatment episodes		191	261	265	296
Average clients in specialized caseloads per month (gang members, domestic violence, women, etc)		2,730	3,342	2,984	3,050
Results					
	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
<i>Juvenile</i>					
Juvenile sex offender treatment success rate	74%	75%	75%	80%	80%
Residential alcohol and drug treatment success rate				70%	71%
Home-based family treatment success rate		35%	61%	66%	70%
<i>Adult</i>					
Residential alcohol and drug treatment success rate		68%	67%	58%	56%
Outpatient alcohol and drug treatment success rate		36%	35%	39%	33%
Drug diversion services treatment success rate		36%	33%	44%	37%

Page Intentionally Blank

District Attorney's Office

Accomplishments FY05



- Successfully completed the migration and installation of CRIMES, the District Attorney's case tracking system.
- Participated in the multi-agency and community Clean Slate Project and assisted over 700 individuals with outstanding legal issues.
- Worked with other criminal justice agencies in and out of the county to establish a Joint Criminal Justice Information Technology Group.
- Increased Support Enforcement collections to nearly \$32 million.

Issues FY05

- Widespread methamphetamine use and production contributed to the rise in identity theft, property crime, and the number of children removed from parental custody.
- With the Portland Police Bureau doubling the size of its gang enforcement unit and the Gresham Police Department creating a new gang enforcement unit, the capacity of the DA's Office to prosecute additional gang-related cases will be a challenge.

The District Attorney's Office (DA) works to prosecute criminals and protect crime victims. Strategies to achieve these goals include: trial advocacy, intervention and diversion, innovative community programs, public education about the law, and fair and consistent application of the law.

- The DA spent \$21.4 million on services in FY05, an increase of 6% over FY01 and an 11% increase since FY03.
- \$31 was spent per county resident in FY05.
- Approximately 76% of funding came from local sources.
- The DA employed the equivalent of 218 full-time employees in FY05.
- Staffing decreased 9% over five years, but increased 4% from FY03 levels.
- In FY05, almost 81% of the Office's expenditures were for personnel.



Prosecution and Victim Advocacy


The District Attorney's Office reviews all crimes presented by law enforcement agencies and has jurisdiction to prosecute all crimes that occur in Multnomah County. To address specific or regional crime areas, the Office participates in numerous task forces, such as narcotics, organized crime, and anti-terrorism. The Office also provides legal information and support to those who have been victims of crime.

- The DA prosecuted nearly 22,000 adult cases in FY05. Behavioral crimes, such as prostitution, DUII, and disorderly conduct, represented 43% of these cases. The number of behavioral crimes prosecuted declined 13% since FY01. Property crimes prosecuted increased 16% over five years.
- The DA also prosecuted 944 juvenile delinquency cases in FY05, a decrease of 37% over five years.
- In FY05, 68% of all adult felony and misdemeanor concluded cases resulted in conviction. The conviction rate for all adult felony cases was higher at 74%. Of the total cases dismissed (31%), 38% were dismissed because the defendant successfully completed a diversion program, and 21% were dismissed as part of plea negotiations because the defendant accepted a conviction in another case.
- \$5.7 million in restitution was ordered for victims in FY05.


Adult Cases Prosecuted by Crime Type



Adult Felony and Misdemeanor Convictions (Percent of concluded cases)



Restitution Ordered for Crime Victims (In millions)




Intervention and Protection


The District Attorney’s Office intervenes in situations to protect vulnerable individuals such as abused and neglected children, persons with mental illness, and victims of domestic abuse and their children. The Office helps parents with child support enforcement and works with those who have committed certain crimes to avoid conviction by offering treatment options at sentencing.

- The number of cases of abused, neglected, and abandoned children needing protection has recently increased.
- The DA represents the public in civil commitment hearings, in which those who are a danger to themselves or others because of mental illness are committed to the state hospital. The number of commitment hearings declined slightly between FY01 and FY04, despite the increase in FY02.
- The DA helps parents establish paternity, create and modify support orders, and collect support for children. These efforts assist children in need, improve family self-sufficiency, return money to the public treasury, and reduce the need for public assistance. Collections have steadily increased since FY01, possibly due to the addition of an office in East County in 1999. In FY05, \$31.6 million was collected.


Cases of Abused, Neglected, and Abandoned Children Needing Protection



Commitment Hearings for Persons with Mental Illness



Amount of Child Support Collected (In millions)




Community-Based Strategies


The Neighborhood District Attorney works closely with police and residential and business community members to improve safety and has helped reduce problems of drug sales, theft from cars, illegal camping, and other crimes. Prosecutors are located at seven offices throughout the county and provide immediate public access to the public safety system. The Community Court is a fast, effective, and neighborhood-based method to sanction and support misdemeanor offenders. Community courts sentence low-level offenders to perform community service in the neighborhoods where they committed their crimes and provide social service assistance when needed.

- Nearly 12,000 misdemeanor cases were reviewed by Neighborhood DAs in FY05.
 - Over 5,000 cases were resolved in Community Court in FY05.
- Over 18,000 hours of community service work was completed in FY05, at an estimated value of over \$130,000 (calculated using Oregon’s \$7.25 per hour minimum wage).


Misdemeanor Cases Reviewed by Neighborhood DA Unit



Cases Resolved in Community Court



Hours of Community Service Completed



District Attorney's Office Data Tables
Prosecution and Victim Advocacy

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Cases of adult criminal activity reviewed					
Person crime cases	7,914	7,634	7,599	7,207	7,473
Property crime cases	10,521	10,051	10,484	11,020	11,429
Behavioral crime cases	12,821	11,263	13,621	11,801	11,599
Juvenile delinquency cases reviewed	2,630	2,056	1,842	2,051	1,899
Cases of adult criminal activity prosecuted					
Person crime cases	3,439	3,316	3,499	3,740	3,570
Property crime cases	7,650	7,559	7,791	8,515	8,890
Behavioral crime cases	10,844	9,561	11,240	9,753	9,476
Juvenile delinquency cases prosecuted	1,487	1,127	947	1,013	944
Adult cases reviewed with victim advocates assigned	4,086	3,218	3,057	3,121	2,605
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Concluded cases ending in conviction for all adult felony and misdemeanor cases	72%	69%	67%	65%	68%
Concluded cases ending in conviction for adult felony cases					
Felony person crimes	75%	70%	71%	72%	71%
Felony property crimes	83%	83%	80%	76%	78%
Felony behavioral crimes	79%	77%	56%	71%	72%
Concluded cases ending in conviction for adult misdemeanor cases					
Misdemeanor person crimes	63%	62%	59%	61%	57%
Misdemeanor property crimes	71%	66%	70%	60%	68%
Misdemeanor behavioral crimes	68%	65%	67%	64%	65%
Cases concluded in dismissal for adult felony cases					
Felony person crimes	23%	28%	27%	26%	27%
Felony property crimes	16%	17%	19%	22%	22%
Felony behavioral crimes	20%	23%	44%	29%	27%
Concluded cases ending in dismissal for adult misdemeanor cases					
Misdemeanor person crimes	32%	35%	38%	36%	40%
Misdemeanor property crimes	28%	33%	30%	40%	32%
Misdemeanor behavioral crimes	30%	33%	32%	34%	34%
Restitution ordered for crime victims	\$ 4,254,096	\$ 5,306,137	\$ 3,216,839	\$ 4,676,495	\$ 5,671,981

NOTE: Dismissals include those defendants that pled guilty to another case and those who successfully entered diversion programs, such as the DUII STOP Program

District Attorney's Office Data Tables
Intervention and Protection

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Abused, neglected, and abandoned children needing protection	687	659	562	768	793
Commitment hearings for persons with mental illness	347	394	354	333	N/A
Protected children freed for adoption	144	147	147	162	130
Child support cases reviewed	8,404	8,413	8,546	8,208	8,340
Drug offenders accepting treatment and recovery opportunities	354	412	710	377	302
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Juvenile offenders referred to diversion programs and receiving services	358	359	385	431	422
Domestic violence defendants accepting deferred sentencing	53%	50%	63%	38%	57%
Total child support collected	\$ 28,529,626	\$ 29,254,926	\$ 29,405,710	\$ 29,560,518	\$31,610,724

Community – Based Strategies

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Misdemeanor cases reviewed by the Neighborhood DA Unit	7,627	5,787	9,395	10,934	11,960
Defendants eligible for Community Court	2,091	3,130	2,857	5,253	6,976
Defendants accepting Community Court	875	1,311	1,307	2,694	3,393
Cases resolved in Community Court	1,114	2,568	2,163	3,475	5,127
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Community Court cases with completed community service	280	589	476	278	1,186
Hours of community service completed	4,676	11,403	8,464	4,668	18,123
Estimated value of community service (calculated using OR minimum wage)	\$ 33,901	\$ 82,672	\$ 61,364	\$ 33,843	\$ 131,392

Sheriff's Office

Accomplishments FY05

- Added temporary holding facility in Gresham and mobile booking to better serve police agencies.
- Worked with the DCJ to locate work release and treatment together, maximizing resources.
- Obtained two new boats with a grant from the Transportation Security Administration.
- Received \$2.1 million in homeland security grants.
- Added tasers to give corrections deputies a less-lethal alternative.


Issues FY05

- Budget cuts have led to reductions in jail beds and impaired ability to hire/retain staff.
- 525 beds at Wapato remain unfunded.
- Four corrections facilities are not at capacity, which limits efficiencies and economies of scale.
- Increased matrix releasing of offenders.
- Reduction of Oregon State Police patrols leaves Sheriff's Office as only law enforcement service in unincorporated areas.


The vision of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office is "Exemplary public service for a safe, livable community." The Sheriff operates the County's jail and other corrections services; provides law enforcement and patrol services to unincorporated Multnomah County and a few cities that contract for services; and provides security for courthouses and courtrooms, transports inmates to and from court, enforces civil court orders, serves notice of process in civil lawsuits, and provides for the care, custody, and transportation of alleged mentally ill persons.

- The Sheriff's Office spent \$97 million on services in FY05, a decrease of 3% since FY01 in constant dollars, but a 6% increase over FY03.
- \$142 was spent per county resident in FY05.
- Approximately 77% of funding came from local tax sources.
- The number of hours worked by Sheriff's Office employees was equal to 805 full-time positions in FY05.
- Staffing decreased 16% over five years.

Spending
(In millions, adjusted for inflation)



Staffing
(Full-Time Equivalent)




Corrections

The Sheriff's Office operates jail facilities in Multnomah County, where sentenced offenders and those awaiting trial are incarcerated. The Sheriff also manages and supports supervised inmate work crews and community monitoring programs and provides assistance to inmates before they are released back into the community.


The Corrections Division also fulfills the statutory obligations to provide security at courthouse facilities and transport inmates to appear in court.

- The number of bookings into Multnomah County jails decreased between FY01 and FY03, but has grown slightly since then. The average daily population has dropped over five years, mirroring a decrease in bed capacity.
- Of those housed in the jails in FY05, 68% have not yet been sentenced for a crime. This is up from 64% in FY01.
- Since FY01, the number of jail beds per 1,000 residents has declined 26% to 2.3.
- In FY05, inmates in Multnomah County jail facilities contributed an estimated \$4.7 million back to the community through disciplinary fines and fees, probation and treatment fees, room and board payments, direct restitution to victims, and work crew labor.


Bookings in County Jails



Jail Beds per 1,000 Residents



Estimated Value of Work Crew Labor, Fines, Fees, and Other Payments FY05




Law Enforcement


The Sheriff’s Office is responsible for policing unincorporated Multnomah County and the cities of Maywood Park and Wood Village. The service area is 289 square miles, or 66% of the land area in the county, but represents approximately 2.5% of the county’s population. Additionally, the Sheriff’s Office patrols rivers, inspects for hazardous materials and truck safety, provides community and school programs, investigates major regional crimes with other agencies, and provides mid-level narcotic trafficking enforcement.

- The rate of serious crime (Part I) against people and property in the Sheriff’s law enforcement area was 55 per 1,000 residents in FY05, an increase of 2% from FY01. Examples of such crimes are homicide, rape, robbery, and kidnapping.
- Lesser crimes (Part II), such as drug crimes, assault, fraud, prostitution, drunk driving, and child abuse increased 2% from FY01. However, there was a 8% decrease between FY04 and FY05.
- On average, deputies responded to calls where there was serious risk of harm more quickly on the Eastside of the County than on the Westside. Response times averaged 17.2 minutes on the Westside and 13.2 minutes on the Eastside in FY05.
- The percent of offenses cleared by an arrest has increased in the last five years.


Crime Rate - Unincorporated county
(Includes Wood Village, and Maywood Park)



Average Response Time
(In minutes)



Offenses cleared by an Arrest
(Part I and Part II Crimes)



Page Intentionally Blank

**Sheriff
Corrections**

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Jail beds per 1,000 residents	3.12	2.88	2.58	2.48	2.30
Average length of stay (in days)	20.42	19.97	19.33	18.33	17.07
Inmates transported between jails and to court	73,654	69,031	58,217	64,761	57,634
Inmates participating in life skills programs	24,112	20,665	10,147	12,516	14,774
Inmates attending GED classes	1,495	994	1,013	2,437	2,576
Records processed	329,434	319,953	303,958	314,420	332,424
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Percent full compliance with Oregon Sheriff's Jail Standards (MCDC only)		93%	95%	N/A	96%
Escapes from jail	0	0	0	1	0
Inmate walk-aways from work crew	2	0	3	1	0
Inmate walk-aways from Restitution/Work Center	58	70	26 ¹	2 ²	16
Major inmate disturbances or incidents (per bed)	N/A	.021	.008	.008	.011
Felony warrants entered within time period (24 hours of issuance)	50%	25%	42%	60%	68%
Misdemeanor warrants entered within time period (3 days of issuance)	42%	92%	42%	45%	43%

Law Enforcement

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Responses to calls for services	37,414	36,063	36,972	35,500	41,260
Incidents dispatched from central dispatch agency (BOEC)	7,489	8,435	8,273	8,648	7,784
Incidents officer initiated	29,925	27,628	28,699	26,852	33,476
Dispatched calls	7,489	8,435	8,273	8,648	7,784
Water safety classes (local schools and adults)	73	13	10	12	32
Results	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Major (Part I) offenses cleared by an arrest	9%	16%	14%	18%	23%
Offenses cleared by an arrest (Part I and Part II)	40%	44%	46%	48%	49%
Special Investigations Unit drug cases sent to District Attorney	125	131	83	57	93
Value of drugs seized by Special Investigations Unit		\$3,724,228	\$3,691,932	\$5,756,103	\$2,044,660
Juvenile crime arrests as percent of total arrests	15%	20%	19%	14%	18%

Court Services

Workload	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
Inmates held for court at courthouse	14,334	13,558	13,545	14,144	12,506
Weapons held at Multnomah County court facilities		No data available			45,668
Percent of persons successfully located and served with notice of civil process	86%	84%	87%	85%	86%
Percent of persons successfully located and served with notice of protective orders	81%	79%	74%	718%	72%
Hearings of allegedly mentally ill persons with security provided	566	605	544	524	504

¹ Based on 6 months data – MCRC closed January 15, 2003

² Based on 6 months data – Restitution Center reopened in January 2004

Page Intentionally Blank

Citizen Survey Results


In the spring of 2005, the Multnomah County Auditor's Office worked with the Portland State University Survey Research Laboratory to conduct a telephone survey of Multnomah County residents. Survey participants were adults from randomly selected households. A total of 20,000 telephone numbers were selected using ASDE survey sampler software. Of those numbers, 54% were directory-listed numbers, and 46% were not directory listed. The non-listed numbers were created by randomly generating the final four digits based on the exchanges in use in Multnomah County. A minimum of five attempts, and as many as ten, were made to reach each working number in the sample. Interviewers were available to interview in Spanish as well as English.

Service delivery districts were developed based on historical service district boundaries. In total, 1,601 interviews were completed. A total of 19,431 telephone numbers were contacted. Of the 19,431 telephone numbers, 8,433 were not valid numbers for the study because they were not in Multnomah County, were group homes, non-working numbers, non-residential, cell phones, or pay phones. A total 3,129 eligible households were contacted. Of those, 1,601 completed the interview and 1,528 refused to be interviewed. This yields an interview completion or response rate of 51%.

Several quality control measures were used for the telephone survey. These included:

- Making all calls from a supervised, centralized interviewing facility.
- Using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system.
- Conducting detailed training of interviewers and supervisors on the survey instrument.
- Monitoring selected calls made by each interviewer.
- Monitoring reports concerning interviewer performance.

The sampling error (at a 95% confidence level) for this survey is +/- 2.5%.



Page Intentionally Blank


Community Characteristics

The purpose of the Multnomah County citizen survey is to obtain information from citizens about their satisfaction with County services and their views on how well the County is doing. While many individual survey items are not directly linked to specific County services, they are designed to measure qualities that can be indirectly linked. We also hope to improve insight into how County government may contribute to citizens' overall feelings of regional and neighborhood livability.


To analyze the survey data, we looked at citizen responses county-wide, and by six geographical districts. These district boundaries were adopted at the time the first survey was implemented and are the same as historical County service boundaries.

- 20% of respondents have lived in the County five years or less and 33% have lived here more than 30 years. The West and Southeast Districts had the most citizens who lived there five years or less.
- The West (55%) and East Districts (44%) had the highest percentage of households with an income over \$59,000.
- Although 49% of respondents reported children 18 or younger in the household, 23% reported they had at least one child enrolled in a public school in the County. The North and East districts had the highest percentage of respondents with children in public school.
- 55% of respondents agree or strongly agree that the elected leadership of Multnomah County manages the County well.


Length of Residency FY05



Average Household Income FY05






Households with Children FY05



Vibrant Community

One of the County’s priorities is that residents should have clean, healthy neighborhoods with a vibrant sense of community. The citizen survey questions residents about specific services that affect the community and, more generally, about the level of government support and problems in the neighborhood.



- There was a slight increase in the number of respondents identifying a problem with a vicious animal in their neighborhood since last year. Of the 128 who reported a problem to Animal Services, 44% were somewhat or very satisfied with the service they received compared to 53% in FY01.
- The number who were very satisfied with Library services has declined by 10% since FY01; however the overall satisfaction has not changed. Ratings have increased slightly since FY01 for location, availability of books and materials.
- In FY05, 89% somewhat or strongly agreed that their neighborhood was a good place to live. This is a decline from 92% in FY01. Only 78% of respondents in the Mid-County district reported their neighborhood was a good place to live while all of the other districts were around 90% or higher.
- 86% somewhat or strongly agree that people are willing to help their neighbors.



Sense of Safety

Another County priority area is that residents should feel safe at home, work, school, and at play. The County provides law enforcement services to the unincorporated County, as well as jails, prosecution, and supervision of adult and juvenile offenders county wide. Feelings of safety in a neighborhood can be affected by several environmental factors such as law enforcement presence, street lighting, and knowing neighbors. While some of these factors may be directly linked to County services, others are not.

- Although there has been an increase in the percent of neighborhood problems reported, ratings for feelings of safety during the day have remained high county-wide. However, feelings of safety at night declined in all of the districts except the West.
- 22% of county residents reported being a victim of a crime in FY05. Of those, 77% stated they reported the crime. Mid-county residents reported the highest incidence of victimization at 27%.
- In FY05, 5% of county residents reported that graffiti was a big problem in their neighborhood. 66% of residents reported no problem with graffiti, down from 73% in FY01.




Basic Needs


Many of the County’s programs are for residents who need assistance meeting basic needs. It is a priority of the County that residents and their families are able to meet their basic needs. The County also provides services that are specifically intended to improve school performance.

- 16% reported that their health was only fair or poor in FY05. This is an increase from 12% from FY01. Poor health was reported at a higher rate in the North and Mid-County districts. 34% reported that their physical health or functioning limited their activities some or a great deal.
- 31% reported that they are aware of homeless adults in their neighborhood. The highest percentage of residents who reported homeless adults was 48% in the Southeast district.
- 40% of all respondents, whether they have a child enrolled in school or not, are somewhat or very satisfied with the education provided in public schools. Satisfaction ranges from 47% in the West district to 31% in the North district.


Health Rated as Fair or Poor



Aware of Homeless Adults in Neighborhood



Satisfaction with Local Public Schools in the County FY05




Accountability


The County recognizes that residents want their government to be accountable at every level. Residents also need to understand how government works and should have opportunities to participate.

- A little over 50% agree or strongly agree that they have confidence that the County’s elected leadership is managing well. Northeast had the most respondents who agreed at 62%.
- In the past five years less than 30% of all respondents were aware of the City/County Telephone Information and Referral Number. Respondents in East (23%) and Mid-county (27%) were the least aware of the telephone service.
- An increasing number of survey respondents report that they have used the County’s web page. 25% of those who used it reported dissatisfaction with the web site.
- According to the survey the County has a high percentage of residents (80%) in FY05 who had access to the Internet either from home or from another location. This has increased from 75% in FY01.


Confidence in County's Elected Leadership
FY05



Aware of City/County
Telephone Number



Reported Use of the County's Web Page



Page Intentionally Blank

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
COUNTY LEADERSHIP											
Q1A - Overall satisfaction with Multnomah County service.											
Very dissatisfied	6%	9%	9%	9%	13%	13%	10%				
Somewhat dissatisfied	19%	23%	17%	22%	23%	25%	22%				
Somewhat satisfied	59%	57%	60%	51%	52%	52%	55%				
Very satisfied	15%	11%	14%	18%	12%	11%	14%				
	(252)	(265)	(283)	(255)	(268)	(252)	(1,575)				
Q1B - I have confidence that the elected leadership of Multnomah County manages the County well.											
Strongly disagree	19%	15%	14%	16%	25%	28%	19%				
Somewhat disagree	27%	31%	24%	29%	25%	27%	27%				
Somewhat agree	45%	48%	54%	46%	45%	40%	46%				
Strongly agree	10%	6%	8%	9%	6%	5%	7%				
	(250)	(261)	(281)	(253)	(267)	(248)	(1,560)				
ANIMAL CONTROL											
Q2A - In the past year, have you had any problems in your neighborhood with barking dogs?											
No	88%	80%	80%	84%	80%	77%	81%	81%	82%	82%	70%
Yes	12%	20%	20%	16%	20%	23%	19%	19%	18%	18%	30%
	(256)	(268)	(287)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,598)	(1,693)	(1,594)	(1,985)	(1,502)
Q2B - In the past year, have you had any problems in your neighborhood with animals running loose?											
No	81%	69%	70%	71%	67%	71%	71%	70%	72%	75%	66%
Yes	19%	31%	30%	30%	34%	29%	29%	30%	28%	25%	34%
	(255)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(256)	(1,597)	(1,691)	(1,591)	(1,988)	(1,502)
Q2C - In the past year, have you had any problems in your neighborhood with a vicious animal?											
No	93%	92%	92%	90%	90%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%	91%
Yes	7%	8%	8%	10%	10%	9%	9%	7%	7%	7%	9%
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(255)	(1,597)	(1,689)	(1,590)	(1,984)	(1,498)

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
ANIMAL CONTROL											
Q2D - In the past year, have you reported an animal problem in your neighborhood to Multnomah County Animal Services:											
No	96%	88%	93%	92%	90%	90%	92%	91%	91%	91%	90%
Yes	4%	12%	7%	8%	10%	10%	8%	9%	9%	9%	10%
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,599)	(1,692)	(1,592)	(1,987)	(1,503)
Q2E - Thinking about the last time you called Multnomah County Animal Services, how satisfied were you with the service you received?											
Very dissatisfied	30%	27%	32%	29%	26%	58%	34%	36%	38%	27%	32%
Somewhat dissatisfied	20%	27%	26%	5%	30%	21%	22%	20%	20%	18%	14%
Somewhat satisfied	10%	20%	37%	33%	26%	4%	22%	20%	19%	24%	25%
Very satisfied	40%	27%	5%	33%	19%	17%	22%	24%	23%	31%	29%
	(10)	(30)	(19)	(21)	(27)	(24)	(131)	(155)	(143)	(160)	(146)
LIBRARY											
Q3A - In the past 12 months, have you visited a Multnomah County library in person?											
No	31%	41%	33%	35%	41%	40%	37%	40%	41%	40%	37%
Yes	69%	59%	67%	66%	59%	60%	63%	60%	59%	60%	63%
	(255)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(271)	(255)	(1,595)	(1,692)	(1,593)	(1,987)	(1,502)
<i>Thinking about the Multnomah County library you usually go to . . .</i>											
Q3B - In general, how satisfied are you with the hours it is open?											
Very dissatisfied	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	15%	13%	13%	8%	10%	6%	11%	10%	8%	8%	7%
Somewhat satisfied	31%	33%	37%	35%	38%	33%	35%	33%	41%	40%	32%
Very satisfied	54%	53%	48%	54%	52%	60%	53%	56%	50%	50%	59%
	(172)	(154)	(193)	(169)	(157)	(154)	(999)	(1,002)	(935)	(1,177)	(932)
Q3C - In general, how satisfied are you with its location?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%	2%	4%	3%	1%	0%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%
Somewhat satisfied	11%	21%	12%	14%	23%	16%	16%	17%	20%	22%	21%
Very satisfied	88%	76%	85%	83%	74%	84%	82%	80%	79%	76%	75%
	(173)	(156)	(194)	(169)	(157)	(154)	(1,003)	(1,010)	(939)	(1,178)	(936)

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
LIBRARY -continued											
Q3D - In general, how satisfied are you with availability of books and materials?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6%	9%	10%	9%	6%	5%	7%	9%	9%	7%	7%
Somewhat satisfied	34%	36%	37%	28%	40%	37%	35%	29%	37%	34%	33%
Very satisfied	60%	55%	52%	62%	53%	57%	56%	60%	53%	56%	58%
	(173)	(153)	(192)	(167)	(156)	(153)	(994)	(993)	(930)	(1,175)	(926)
Q3E - In general, how satisfied are you with the assistance provided by library staff?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%	5%	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Somewhat satisfied	18%	25%	17%	23%	27%	20%	21%	18%	21%	21%	19%
Very satisfied	81%	70%	82%	74%	68%	77%	76%	79%	77%	76%	79%
	(166)	(152)	(190)	(168)	(152)	(153)	(981)	(984)	(914)	(1,150)	(917)
Q3F - In general, how satisfied are you with the children's programs?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	3%	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%	1%	2%	4%	2%	0%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%
Somewhat satisfied	18%	24%	25%	17%	24%	22%	21%	21%	28%	27%	26%
Very satisfied	36%	40%	34%	42%	45%	48%	41%	75%	69%	69%	69%
Not applicable – no children	45%	33%	38%	37%	29%	29%	35%	(374)	(344)	(462)	(386)
	(142)	(116)	(155)	(138)	(123)	(128)	(802)				
Q3G - In the past year, have you contacted the Multnomah County library by telephone?											
No	70%	79%	67%	68%	83%	81%	75%	74%	76%	75%	70%
Yes	30%	21%	33%	32%	17%	20%	26%	26%	24%	25%	30%
	(254)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,597)	(1,692)	(1,588)	(1,983)	(1,502)
Q3H - In the past year, have you contacted the Multnomah County library by computer?											
No	72%	74%	59%	63%	75%	73%	69%	73%	76%	79%	78%
Yes	28%	26%	41%	37%	25%	27%	31%	27%	24%	21%	22%
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(257)	(273)	(256)	(1,598)	(1,690)	(1,591)	(1,985)	(1,504)

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid- Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
LIBRARY - continued											
Q3I - Overall, how satisfied are you with Multnomah County libraries?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%
Somewhat satisfied	29%	36%	33%	30%	39%	34%	33%	32%	30%	30%	24%
Very satisfied	69%	61%	64%	66%	57%	62%	63%	64%	66%	67%	73%
	(230)	(238)	(262)	(236)	(233)	(230)	(1,429)	(1,448)	(1,269)	(1,607)	(1,203)
VOTING											
Q4A - In the last year, did you vote in Multnomah County?											
No	13%	17%	11%	11%	22%	18%	15%				
Yes	87%	83%	89%	89%	78%	82%	85%				
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(257)	(273)	(256)	(1,598)				
Q4B - Did you not vote because:											
You did not want to	18%	23%	21%	28%	9%	7%	16%				
Your are not registered to vote in Multnomah County	49%	40%	38%	28%	47%	40%	41%				
Some other reason	33%	37%	41%	45%	44%	53%	43%				
	(33)	(43)	(29)	(29)	(57)	(45)	(236)				
Q4C - Are you not registered to vote because:											
You do not want to be registered	13%	31%	27%	50%	19%	50%	30%				
You do not know how to register	6%	38%	9%	0%	27%	22%	20%				
Some other reason	81%	31%	64%	50%	54%	28%	51%				
	(16)	(16)	(11)	(8)	(26)	(18)	(95)				

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
SCHOOL DISTRICT SERVICES											
Q5A - Thinking about local public schools in Multnomah County, how satisfied are you with the education provided?											
Very dissatisfied	21%	36%	26%	27%	28%	31%	28%	20%			
Somewhat dissatisfied	32%	33%	36%	34%	28%	27%	32%	29%			
Somewhat satisfied	36%	26%	31%	32%	36%	31%	32%	34%			
Very satisfied	11%	5%	7%	8%	8%	12%	8%	17%			
	(210)	(230)	(242)	(213)	(250)	(233)	(1,378)	(1,287)			
Q5B - Would you agree or disagree that schools are spending their dollars wisely?											
Strongly disagree	30%	44%	29%	29%	39%	46%	36%	33%			
Somewhat disagree	27%	26%	28%	26%	29%	22%	26%	27%			
Somewhat agree	30%	22%	32%	29%	23%	24%	27%	27%			
Strongly agree	13%	7%	12%	16%	10%	7%	11%	13%			
	(229)	(246)	(260)	(232)	(252)	(239)	(1,458)	(1,452)			
Q5C - Do you have at least one child who is enrolled in a public school in Multnomah County?											
No	83%	71%	82%	84%	76%	68%	78%	77%			
Yes	17%	29%	18%	16%	24%	32%	23%	23%			
	(255)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,598)	(1,693)			
Q5D - What school does he/she attend?											

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
COUNTY SERVICES											
Q6A - In the past year, have you attempted to find out about or use any city or county service besides animal services or the library?											
No	70%	68%	66%	60%	69%	70%	67%	69%	70%	76%	72%
Yes	30%	32%	34%	40%	31%	30%	33%	31%	30%	24%	28%
	(250)	(264)	(286)	(254)	(271)	(253)	(1,578)	(1,651)	(1,565)	(1,924)	(1,485)
Q6B - How difficult or easy was it to find the service?											
Very difficult	7%	13%	14%	8%	11%	15%	11%	12%	13%	13%	
Somewhat difficult	32%	26%	20%	27%	25%	27%	26%	25%	16%	14%	
Somewhat easy	34%	38%	40%	38%	38%	37%	38%	28%	28%	18%	
Very easy	27%	24%	26%	28%	26%	21%	25%	35%	43%	55%	
	(74)	(85)	(98)	(102)	(84)	(75)	(518)	(511)	(454)	(456)	
Q6C - Did you know there is a City/County Telephone Information and Referral number?											
No	66%	70%	69%	70%	73%	77%	71%	74%	76%	76%	72%
Yes	34%	30%	31%	30%	27%	23%	29%	26%	24%	24%	28%
	(255)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(270)	(256)	(1,594)	(1,688)	(1,590)	(1,978)	(1,500)
Q6D - Have you used the City/County Information and Referral number in the past year?											
No	63%	67%	67%	53%	64%	70%	64%	70%	72%	63%	68%
Yes	37%	33%	33%	47%	37%	30%	36%	30%	28%	37%	32%
	(86)	(79)	(90)	(77)	(74)	(57)	(463)	(426)	(384)	(471)	(415)

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
COUNTY SERVICES -continued											
Q6E - How satisfied were you with the information received?											
Very dissatisfied	9%	23%	7%	19%	15%	0%	13%	12%	15%	7%	8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	9%	12%	13%	17%	11%	6%	12%	12%	9%	9%	5%
Somewhat satisfied	28%	31%	37%	25%	37%	65%	35%	30%	25%	29%	30%
Very satisfied	53%	35%	43%	39%	37%	29%	41%	46%	51%	55%	57%
	(32)	(26)	(30)	(36)	(27)	(17)	(168)	(129)	(107)	(170)	(131)
Q7A - Do you have access to the Internet either from home or from another location?											
No	13%	25%	13%	17%	29%	22%	20%	21%	24%	26%	25%
Yes	88%	75%	87%	83%	71%	78%	80%	79%	76%	74%	75%
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,599)	(1,692)	(1,593)	(1,988)	(1,504)
Q7B - Did you know Multnomah County has a web page?											
No	44%	37%	35%	31%	40%	43%	38%	40%	45%	47%	50%
Yes	56%	64%	65%	70%	60%	58%	62%	60%	55%	53%	50%
	(224)	(200)	(250)	(213)	(192)	(200)	(1,279)	(1,340)	(1,215)	(1,470)	(1,131)
Q7C - Have you ever used the Multnomah County web page?											
No	54%	44%	45%	55%	50%	53%	50%	49%	61%	57%	61%
Yes	46%	56%	55%	45%	50%	47%	50%	51%	39%	43%	39%
	(123)	(127)	(162)	(145)	(114)	(114)	(785)	(804)	(661)	(777)	(560)
Q7D - How satisfied were you with the web page?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	0%	6%	3%	4%	9%	4%	3%	2%	1%	3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	18%	16%	2%	11%	9%	11%	11%	10%	8%	7%	7%
Somewhat satisfied	61%	54%	63%	68%	58%	52%	60%	55%	56%	48%	48%
Very satisfied	21%	30%	29%	18%	30%	28%	26%	32%	34%	44%	42%
	(56)	(69)	(86)	(62)	(57)	(54)	(384)	(395)	(247)	(305)	(201)

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
COUNTY SERVICES - continued											
Q8A - In the past year, have you been a victim of a crime?											
No	87%	76%	78%	74%	73%	80%	78%	78%	79%	80%	
Yes	13%	24%	22%	26%	27%	20%	22%	22%	21%	20%	
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(256)	(1,598)	(1,693)	(1,592)	(1,989)	
Q8B - Did you report the crime?											
No	12%	27%	29%	31%	14%	19%	23%	26%	26%	28%	
Yes	88%	73%	71%	69%	86%	81%	77%	74%	74%	72%	
	(33)	(64)	(63)	(68)	(73)	(52)	(353)	(378)	(333)	(405)	
Q8C - Did you have contact with the District Attorney's Office?											
No	82%	78%	87%	93%	89%	90%	87%	90%	91%	88%	
Yes	18%	22%	13%	7%	11%	10%	13%	10%	9%	12%	
	(33)	(64)	(62)	(68)	(73)	(52)	(352)	(390)	(331)	(403)	
Q8D - Did they inform you of services that may help you?											
No	80%	36%	38%	80%	63%	20%	49%	33%	28%	36%	
Yes	20%	64%	63%	20%	38%	80%	51%	67%	72%	64%	
	(5)	(14)	(8)	(5)	(8)	(5)	(45)	(40)	(29)	(47)	
Q8E - Did you receive help from a DA-appointed victim's advocate?											
No	100%	88%	97%	96%	96%	94%	95%	85%	85%	52%	
Yes	0%	13%	3%	4%	4%	6%	5%	15%	15%	48%	
	(32)	(64)	(62)	(68)	(73)	(52)	(351)	(27)	(20)	(29)	
Q8F - Overall, how satisfied were you with this service?											
Very dissatisfied	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	6%	0%	0%	7%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	7%	
Somewhat satisfied	0%	25%	50%	0%	67%	50%	33%	0%	67%	22%	
Very satisfied	0%	63%	50%	100%	33%	0%	56%	100%	33%	64%	
	(0)	(8)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(2)	(18)	(4)	(3)	(14)	

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
COUNTY SERVICES - continued											
Q9A - Do you use any of these bridges at least once a week: Sellwood, Hawthorne, Morrison, Burnside, Broadway, and/or Sauvie Island?											
No	40%	38%	31%	26%	64%	73%	45%	45%	50%	44%	
Yes	60%	62%	69%	74%	36%	27%	55%	55%	50%	56%	
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(255)	(1,598)	(1,693)	(1,591)	(1,982)	
Q9B - In the past year, have you experienced a bridge closure or delay due to a special event or construction?											
No	43%	33%	32%	46%	54%	62%	42%	43%	39%	38%	
Yes	57%	67%	68%	54%	46%	38%	58%	57%	61%	62%	
	(154)	(166)	(199)	(192)	(98)	(69)	(878)	(921)	(786)	(1,093)	
Q9C - Do you feel you were adequately notified in advance of the changes in traffic flow due to the event or construction?											
No	25%	26%	17%	24%	31%	16%	23%	27%	24%	23%	
Yes	75%	74%	83%	76%	69%	84%	77%	73%	76%	77%	
	(88)	(109)	(133)	(103)	(45)	(25)	(503)	(512)	(474)	(671)	

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid- Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
NEIGHBORHOOD											
Q10A – I think my neighborhood is a good place for me to live.											
Strongly disagree	1%	3%	3%	1%	7%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
Somewhat disagree	5%	6%	5%	7%	15%	9%	8%	6%	6%	5%	5%
Somewhat agree	19%	29%	26%	34%	41%	34%	30%	28%	30%	30%	28%
Strongly Agree	75%	63%	67%	58%	37%	55%	59%	63%	62%	62%	64%
	(252)	(256)	(279)	(252)	(257)	(248)	(1,544)	(1,662)	(1,579)	(1,966)	(1,492)
Q10B - I feel there is a sense of community in my neighborhood.											
Strongly disagree	8%	7%	5%	6%	17%	11%	9%	9%	7%	7%	8%
Somewhat disagree	16%	15%	14%	15%	21%	15%	16%	15%	16%	13%	13%
Somewhat agree	40%	41%	42%	40%	46%	46%	43%	39%	40%	43%	42%
Strongly Agree	36%	37%	40%	39%	17%	29%	33%	37%	37%	37%	37%
	(253)	(262)	(282)	(254)	(266)	(253)	(1,570)	(1,653)	(1,556)	(1,925)	(1,458)
Q10C - If children in my community were doing something wrong, neighbors would do something about it.											
Strongly disagree	7%	12%	7%	10%	15%	8%	10%	8%	6%	6%	7%
Somewhat disagree	12%	13%	17%	13%	19%	15%	15%	13%	13%	10%	13%
Somewhat agree	41%	37%	40%	42%	38%	42%	40%	38%	42%	43%	40%
Strongly Agree	40%	38%	36%	35%	27%	36%	35%	41%	39%	41%	40%
	(236)	(258)	(269)	(242)	(253)	(241)	(1,499)	(1,542)	(1,449)	(1,817)	(1,339)
Q10D - Adults in my community know the kids in their neighborhood.											
Strongly disagree	13%	16%	10%	10%	17%	8%	13%	11%	9%	9%	12%
Somewhat disagree	19%	17%	17%	22%	22%	18%	19%	19%	19%	15%	19%
Somewhat agree	43%	41%	42%	45%	42%	44%	43%	39%	43%	44%	40%
Strongly Agree	25%	27%	31%	23%	18%	30%	26%	31%	29%	32%	29%
	(226)	(248)	(260)	(235)	(250)	(237)	(1,456)	(1,517)	(1,410)	(1,772)	(1,330)

Citizen Survey

2005

Prior Year
TOTALS

NEIGHBORHOOD - continued

Q10E - Very few of my neighbors know me.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly Agree

Q10F - People around here are willing to help their neighbors.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly Agree

Q10G - I can recognize most of the people who live on my block.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly Agree

Q10H - You can count on adults in this neighborhood to watch out that children are safe.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly Agree

Q10I - People move in and out of my neighborhood a lot.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly Agree

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
Q10E - Very few of my neighbors know me.											
Strongly disagree	36%	31%	35%	26%	23%	27%	30%	34%	28%	30%	29%
Somewhat disagree	23%	24%	19%	25%	25%	17%	22%	24%	24%	22%	21%
Somewhat agree	24%	26%	27%	28%	28%	35%	28%	22%	29%	29%	28%
Strongly Agree	18%	20%	19%	21%	25%	21%	21%	20%	19%	19%	22%
	(251)	(260)	(281)	(251)	(261)	(248)	(1,552)	(1,664)	(1,572)	(1,972)	(1,496)
Q10F - People around here are willing to help their neighbors.											
Strongly disagree	3%	7%	6%	4%	13%	6%	7%	6%	4%	5%	5%
Somewhat disagree	6%	7%	4%	8%	12%	6%	7%	7%	7%	6%	8%
Somewhat agree	45%	36%	45%	44%	38%	47%	42%	41%	44%	43%	41%
Strongly Agree	46%	50%	45%	44%	37%	41%	44%	46%	45%	46%	46%
	(253)	(264)	(280)	(251)	(268)	(249)	(1,565)	(1,641)	(1,518)	(1,910)	(1,451)
Q10G - I can recognize most of the people who live on my block.											
Strongly disagree	7%	8%	4%	7%	13%	11%	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%
Somewhat disagree	12%	7%	11%	9%	16%	11%	11%	10%	12%	10%	10%
Somewhat agree	31%	26%	27%	34%	30%	27%	29%	28%	31%	35%	28%
Strongly Agree	50%	59%	59%	51%	42%	51%	52%	54%	50%	48%	54%
	(254)	(264)	(287)	(255)	(273)	(254)	(1,587)	(1,674)	(1,582)	(1,971)	(1,491)
Q10H - You can count on adults in this neighborhood to watch out that children are safe.											
Strongly disagree	5%	7%	5%	5%	11%	6%	6%	6%	4%	5%	6%
Somewhat disagree	12%	11%	12%	12%	13%	11%	12%	11%	11%	8%	9%
Somewhat agree	32%	36%	40%	42%	37%	40%	38%	37%	40%	41%	37%
Strongly Agree	51%	46%	44%	42%	40%	43%	44%	46%	45%	46%	48%
	(235)	(254)	(265)	(240)	(256)	(241)	(1,491)	(1,535)	(1,423)	(1,836)	(1,371)
Q10I - People move in and out of my neighborhood a lot.											
Strongly disagree	38%	36%	35%	32%	31%	40%	35%	39%	35%	38%	38%
Somewhat disagree	24%	31%	32%	29%	25%	28%	28%	27%	30%	28%	26%
Somewhat agree	21%	17%	24%	21%	20%	14%	20%	19%	22%	21%	20%
Strongly Agree	18%	16%	9%	18%	24%	18%	17%	15%	13%	13%	16%
	(253)	(262)	(284)	(248)	(264)	(250)	(1,561)	(1,637)	(1,553)	(1,913)	(1,452)

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
NEIGHBORHOOD - continued											
Q10J - I regularly stop and talk with the people in my neighborhood.											
Strongly disagree	10%	11%	8%	8%	17%	15%	11%	11%	11%	11%	13%
Somewhat disagree	17%	14%	13%	13%	19%	18%	16%	13%	17%	13%	13%
Somewhat agree	35%	35%	37%	44%	38%	35%	37%	39%	38%	42%	39%
Strongly Agree	38%	40%	41%	36%	27%	32%	36%	37%	34%	34%	35%
	(254)	(266)	(287)	(257)	(273)	(255)	(1,592)	(1,672)	(1,579)	(1,966)	(1,494)
Q11A - In your neighborhood how much of a problem is kids who are not in school during the day?											
No problem at all	86%	73%	75%	80%	70%	77%	77%	79%	80%	80%	82%
Somewhat of a problem	11%	21%	20%	16%	26%	19%	19%	18%	17%	16%	15%
A big problem	3%	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%
	(243)	(243)	(265)	(233)	(255)	(242)	(1,481)	(1,567)	(1,453)	(1,810)	(1,293)
Q11B - How much of a problem is alcohol or drug abuse in your neighborhood?											
No problem at all	64%	45%	44%	41%	47%	61%	50%	61%	66%	66%	63%
Somewhat of a problem	26%	37%	45%	44%	32%	28%	36%	30%	25%	25%	28%
A big problem	10%	18%	11%	15%	21%	11%	14%	9%	9%	9%	9%
	(235)	(256)	(275)	(242)	(256)	(237)	(1,501)	(1,573)	(1,466)	(1,809)	(1,289)
Q11C - How much of a problem is neighbors fighting in your neighborhood?											
No problem at all	86%	74%	80%	79%	73%	83%	79%	80%	84%	83%	83%
Somewhat of a problem	13%	22%	15%	19%	22%	13%	18%	17%	14%	14%	14%
A big problem	2%	4%	5%	3%	5%	4%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%
	(250)	(264)	(287)	(256)	(272)	(253)	(1,582)	(1,661)	(1,559)	(1,932)	(1,454)
Q11C1 -How often is this fighting within a family?											
Never	19%	22%	6%	16%	11%	15%	15%	16%	19%	19%	13%
Sometimes	61%	42%	55%	63%	70%	54%	57%	55%	51%	50%	56%
Often	19%	37%	39%	20%	20%	31%	28%	29%	30%	31%	31%
	(31)	(65)	(51)	(49)	(66)	(39)	(301)	(290)	(223)	(298)	(197)

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
NEIGHBORHOOD - continued											
Q11D - How much of a problem is graffiti in your neighborhood?											
No problem at all	77%	67%	57%	61%	68%	65%	66%	72%	78%	78%	73%
Somewhat of a problem	21%	29%	36%	35%	26%	28%	29%	24%	18%	20%	23%
A big problem	2%	5%	8%	5%	6%	7%	5%	4%	4%	2%	4%
	(255)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(255)	(1,595)	(1,686)	(1,585)	(1,968)	(1,486)
Q11E - How much of a problem in your neighborhood are kids hanging around after school and on weekends?											
No problem at all	87%	75%	72%	87%	69%	71%	77%	81%	84%	83%	82%
Somewhat of a problem	10%	17%	23%	12%	26%	25%	19%	15%	14%	14%	14%
A big problem	3%	8%	5%	2%	6%	4%	5%	4%	2%	3%	4%
	(254)	(264)	(287)	(256)	(270)	(255)	(1,586)	(1,671)	(1,547)	(1,932)	(1,455)
Q12A - Are you aware of any homeless adults in your neighborhood?											
No	72%	65%	62%	52%	81%	86%	69%	71%	76%	77%	75%
Yes	28%	35%	38%	48%	19%	15%	31%	29%	24%	23%	25%
	(256)	(268)	(286)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,597)	(1,688)	(1,591)	(1,955)	(1,497)
Q12B - Are you aware of any homeless children in your neighborhood?											
No	97%	97%	98%	97%	99%	98%	98%	98%	97%	98%	96%
Yes	3%	3%	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(255)	(271)	(256)	(1,594)	(1,684)	(1,583)	(1,957)	(1,495)
Q13A - In general, how safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood during the day?											
Very unsafe	0%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Somewhat unsafe	2%	3%	3%	3%	6%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%
Somewhat safe	13%	24%	22%	17%	27%	17%	20%	17%	17%	16%	15%
Very safe	86%	72%	75%	78%	66%	79%	76%	79%	79%	80%	82%
	(255)	(268)	(287)	(258)	(273)	(255)	(1,596)	(1,687)	(1,580)	(1,972)	(1,499)
Q13B - In general, how safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood at night?											
Very unsafe	6%	9%	14%	8%	16%	9%	10%	10%	9%	9%	8%
Somewhat unsafe	15%	24%	22%	18%	23%	21%	21%	17%	18%	17%	14%
Somewhat safe	33%	37%	33%	38%	37%	34%	35%	35%	38%	39%	39%
Very safe	47%	29%	31%	36%	24%	36%	34%	38%	35%	35%	39%
	(255)	(266)	(287)	(253)	(270)	(252)	(1,583)	(1,650)	(1,534)	(1,893)	(1,431)

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
CULTURAL OPPORTUNITIES											
Q14A – How satisfied are you with the adequacy for recreational activities in your community?											
Very dissatisfied	5%	7%	8%	7%	10%	9%	8%				
Somewhat dissatisfied	7%	15%	9%	9%	21%	18%	13%				
Somewhat satisfied	39%	50%	48%	49%	48%	51%	48%				
Very satisfied	49%	27%	35%	36%	21%	22%	32%				
	(247)	(256)	(279)	(242)	(252)	(238)	(1,514)				
Q14B - How satisfied were you with the adequacy of cultural opportunities?											
Very dissatisfied	6%	10%	7%	7%	15%	6%	8%				
Somewhat dissatisfied	12%	18%	17%	17%	22%	23%	18%				
Somewhat satisfied	38%	53%	47%	43%	46%	51%	46%				
Very dissatisfied	44%	19%	29%	34%	17%	20%	27%				
	(243)	(244)	(278)	(234)	(236)	(225)	(1,460)				
Q14C How satisfied were you with the adequacy of opportunities of learning something new?											
Very dissatisfied	4%	10%	7%	5%	7%	7%	7%				
Somewhat dissatisfied	11%	18%	10%	12%	18%	12%	14%				
Somewhat satisfied	41%	49%	50%	53%	51%	51%	49%				
Very satisfied	45%	23%	33%	31%	24%	30%	31%				
	(242)	(241)	(262)	(238)	(235)	(222)	(1,440)				

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
OTHER											
Q15 - In what year were you born?											
Q16 - Gender?											
Male	42%	45%	39%	41%	45%	38%	42%	41%	41%	40%	40%
Female	58%	55%	62%	59%	55%	62%	59%	59%	59%	60%	60%
	(256)	(268)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,599)	(1,692)	(1,594)	(1,989)	(1,508)
Q17 - How would you describe your current marital status?											
Single	19%	19%	26%	26%	18%	11%	20%	18%	17%	23%	23%
Married	49%	47%	48%	40%	52%	61%	49%	53%	53%	48%	51%
Living with a partner	4%	11%	6%	10%	4%	4%	7%	7%	7%	7%	4%
Separated	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Divorced	18%	16%	13%	13%	12%	14%	14%	12%	12%	12%	12%
Widowed	9%	6%	6%	7%	12%	7%	8%	8%	9%	8%	8%
	(254)	(266)	(286)	(258)	(270)	(254)	(1,588)	(1,686)	(1,586)	(1,964)	(1,492)
Q18 - Would you describe yourself as any of the following: Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin?											
No	96%	87%	94%	97%	89%	90%	92%	93%	94%	95%	97%
Yes	4%	13%	6%	3%	11%	10%	8%	7%	6%	5%	3%
	(253)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(255)	(1,594)	(1,685)	(1,586)	(1,973)	(1,502)
Q19 - How would you describe your race?											
White	90%	80%	76%	84%	83%	85%	83%	83%	87%	84%	87%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Black or African - American	2%	5%	11%	1%	1%	0%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%
Multi-racial	3%	4%	6%	7%	5%	5%	5%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Other	4%	7%	5%	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%	4%	6%	3%
	(249)	(256)	(287)	(252)	(264)	(249)	(1,557)	(1,673)	(1,577)	(1,951)	(1,482)

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
	OTHER - continued										
Q20 - What is the highest grade or level of school you have completed?											
Less than 8 years	1%	3%	1%	0%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Some high school, without a diploma	2%	8%	2%	2%	7%	5%	4%	6%	5%	6%	6%
High school diploma or GED	10%	19%	13%	18%	26%	25%	18%	20%	21%	19%	19%
Associate Degree	4%	8%	5%	6%	10%	11%	7%	7%	8%	8%	6%
Some college, but no degree	17%	29%	28%	32%	29%	34%	28%	27%	26%	31%	30%
Bachelor's degree	30%	19%	25%	22%	17%	14%	21%	20%	21%	17%	20%
Some graduate study, but no degree	7%	2%	4%	5%	3%	1%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%
Graduate or professional degree	29%	12%	22%	16%	7%	7%	15%	14%	14%	13%	15%
	(255)	(267)	(287)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,596)	(1,686)	(1,590)	(1,972)	(1,495)
Q21 - About how many hours a week on average, if any, do you work?											
Q22 - In general, would you say your health is:											
Excellent	33%	17%	26%	26%	19%	24%	24%	29%	26%	31%	29%
Very good	30%	32%	34%	35%	31%	32%	33%	32%	37%	33%	36%
Good	28%	29%	27%	26%	26%	28%	27%	21%	21%	22%	23%
Fair	7%	18%	9%	10%	17%	12%	12%	13%	11%	11%	9%
Poor	2%	4%	4%	3%	7%	4%	4%	5%	5%	3%	3%
	(254)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(273)	(256)	(1,596)	(1,689)	(1,586)	(1,976)	(1,499)
Q23 - On a typical day, to what extent does your physical health or functioning limit your activities?											
Not at all	70%	63%	69%	67%	57%	65%	65%	65%	65%	69%	73%
Some	24%	29%	26%	27%	32%	27%	27%	26%	27%	24%	21%
A great deal	6%	8%	5%	5%	11%	8%	7%	9%	8%	7%	6%
	(253)	(266)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(256)	(1,593)	(1,686)	(1,586)	(1,962)	(1,490)

Citizen Survey

	2005							Prior Year TOTALS			
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid-Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
OTHER - continued											
Q24 - On a typical day, to what extent do emotional or mental health problems limit your activities?											
Not at all	85%	78%	80%	79%	77%	83%	80%	84%	84%	84%	85%
Some	12%	18%	17%	18%	19%	14%	17%	14%	15%	14%	13%
A great deal	3%	4%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%
	(252)	(265)	(288)	(256)	(272)	(254)	(1,587)	(1,681)	(1,583)	(1,958)	(1,492)
Q25 - How many children and adults, including yourself, are living in your household right now?											
Q26 - Of the people in your household, how many are children aged 18 or younger?											
Q27 - Do you live in:											
Single family home	66%	85%	76%	73%	69%	76%	74%	76%	75%	77%	77%
A 2,3-,or 4-plex	2%	4%	8%	10%	5%	5%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%
A larger apartment or condominium complex	31%	9%	14%	14%	21 %	18%	18%	15%	15%	13%	15%
Other	1%	2%	2%	3%	5%	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%
	(255)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(256)	(1,596)	(1,689)	(1,589)	(1,978)	(1,500)
Q28 - Do you rent or own?											
Rent	32%	25%	30%	36%	35%	25%	30%	27%	29%	31%	30%
Own	68%	75%	70%	64%	65%	75%	70%	73%	71%	69%	70%
	(253)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(270)	(254)	(1,590)	(1,681)	(1,583)	(1,967)	(1,495)

Citizen Survey

	2005						Prior Year TOTALS				
	W	N	NE	SE	Mid- Co	E	Co Total	2004	2003	2002	2001
OTHER - continued											
Q29 - What language do you usually speak at home?											
English	96%	89%	94%	96%	86%	88%	92%	93%	92%	94%	96%
Spanish	2%	9%	3%	3%	8%	9%	5%	5%	4%	3%	1%
Other	2%	2%	2%	2%	6%	4%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%
	(256)	(267)	(288)	(258)	(272)	(256)	(1,597)	(1,689)	(1,589)	(1,984)	(1,499)
Q30 - Which of the following statements best describes your ability to get along on your household income?											
You can't make ends meet	8%	9%	6%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%	7%	6%	7%
You have just enough, no more	18%	28%	25%	23%	28%	22%	24%	26%	23%	23%	21%
You have enough, with a little extra sometimes	38%	41%	45%	48%	41%	42%	42%	43%	46%	48%	44%
You always have money left over	37%	23%	25%	22%	23%	27%	26%	24%	24%	23%	28%
	(252)	(262)	(283)	(256)	(269)	(252)	(1,574)	(1,654)	(1,565)	(1,920)	(1,456)
Q31 - Adding together the income of all people in your household, could you please tell us approximately what your total household income was last year, from all sources, before taxes? (MEAN)											
							\$62,298 (1,259)	\$59,348 (1,282)	\$58,595 (1,134)	\$55,079 (1,304)	\$58,124 (1,089)