

Service Efforts & Accomplishments Public Safety FY2003

February 2004

The Index page of this document
contains active links.



Suzanne Flynn
Multnomah County Auditor



SUZANNE FLYNN
Multnomah County Auditor
501 SE Hawthorne, Room 601
Portland, Oregon 97214
Telephone (503) 988-3320
Fax (503) 988-3019
www.multnomah.or.us/auditor

Date: February 5, 2004

To: Diane Linn, Multnomah County Chair
Maria Rojo de Steffey, Commissioner, District 1
Serena Cruz, Commissioner, District 2
Lisa Naito, Commissioner, District 3
Lonnie Roberts, Commissioner, District 4

Joanne Fuller, Director, Department of Community Justice
Bernie Giusto, Sheriff
Michael Schrunk, District Attorney

From: Suzanne Flynn, Multnomah County Auditor

Subject: Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report: Public Safety FY2003

I am pleased to share our 4th annual Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report. Each year we alternate the report between the public safety system and social and health services. This is the second year of reporting for the Department of Community Justice and the District Attorney's Office and the third year for the Sheriff's Office. As this report becomes more routine, the reporting process and data collection are becoming easier. However, we continue to adjust and add new measures based upon improving data systems and changing funding patterns and priorities.

This year, the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council was added as a chapter. This allows us to look at system-wide goals, efforts, and performance. I am hopeful that this will formally acknowledge the cooperation that exists in this system and also assist in system-wide efforts.

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

Audit Staff: LaVonne Griffin-Valade, Janis Koch, Sarah Landis

Table of Contents

Service Efforts and Accomplishments

Public Safety FY2003

Introduction -----	1	Sheriff -----	31
Local Public Safety Coordinating Council -----	5	Citizen Survey -----	41
Department of Community Justice -----	11	Appendix -----	49
District Attorney -----	21		

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.

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 2000, 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. In 2001, 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 FY2003 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. This is the second year of reporting for the District Attorney and for Community Justice. These reports have improved markedly from the first report. This is the third year of reporting for the Sheriff’s Office.

All three departments were affected by budget reductions in the previous two years. Measures that reported on programs that have been reduced or eliminated have changed or have been removed from the report.

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 General Standards section of *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 about 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.

Sheriff Comparability Measures. We gathered data from four counties that we determined to be comparable to Multnomah County and the Sheriff’s Office. These counties were chosen based upon similarity of population, density, land area, and cost of living. In addition to similar characteristics of the jurisdiction, the counties also had similarities in size and population of unincorporated land area and the Sheriff’s Offices

delivered both law enforcement and jail services. We contacted personnel in each county to determine the number of patrol officers and jail beds. The Multnomah County Sheriff's Office assisted us in designing the questions to ask.

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, for these services, 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 perceptions about 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 2003. Of the 2,527 households with which contact was made, 1,525 completed the interview, and 932 refused to be interviewed. This yields a response rate of 63%. The results of this survey are reported in the Citizen Survey section of the report. The appendix contains the complete survey interview.

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.

Acknowledgements

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.

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 championing the effort and giving staff the time to work on this project.

Community Justice: Scott Keir and Charlene Rhyne

District Attorney: John Bradley, Sara Cox, Kevin Demer, Jodi Erickson, Wendy Goodyear, Robyn Gregory, Amy Hehn, Leah Ivey, John Kavorinos, Karl Kosydar, Fred Lenzser, Helen O’Brien, Wayne Pearson, Judy Phelan, Marcelyn Radke, Helen Smith, and Jo’ey Stewart

State Court Administrator’s Office: Doug Bray and Eric Hall

Sheriff: Sharon Owen, Christine Kirk, and Larry Aab

Multnomah County GIS

Overview



Accomplishments

- Completed second review of racial over-representation in the criminal justice system
- Completed an evaluation of local services via a contract with the National Institute of Corrections
- Worked on creating a fatal incident review process for domestic violence cases
- Reviewed and reported on progress in implementing recommendations for improving outcomes for persons with mental illness in the criminal justice system
- Worked with LPSCC partner agencies to systematically address budget cuts

Issues

- State and County budget cuts affect the public safety system and ability to maintain services

The Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) brings together agencies that work or are interested in public safety to assure that policies and programs work in a coordinated manner across jurisdictional lines.



* Adapted from Ensuring Equitable Treatment in the Criminal Justice System: Addressing Over-Representation of Racial and Ethnic Minorities, An Assessment and Action Plan by the Multnomah County Public Safety Coordinating Council's work on minority over-representation in the criminal justice system. Draft report dated October 2000. Page 11.


Local Public Safety Coordinating Council

Spending and Staffing

SPENDING

The County spent approximately \$179.4 million on public safety services in the Sheriff’s Office, District Attorney’s Office and the Department of Community Justice in FY2003 (June 1, 2002 – June 30, 2003). This is an increase of 2% since FY1999, but a 3% decrease from FY2001 spending.


- \$268 dollars were spent per county resident.
- Approximately 60% of the public safety system’s funding came from local sources, with state and federal sources accounting for most of the remainder.
- The state and federal portion of funding has grown from 31% in FY1999 to 36% in FY2003.



STAFFING

Employees provide services in law enforcement, jail operations, prosecution, community supervision of probationers and parolees, and court services.

- Personnel costs in FY2003 were \$125.8 million.
- Number of hours worked by employees in the Sheriff’s Office, District Attorney’s Office, and the Department of Community Justice in FY2003 was equal to 1,664 full-time employees.
- Staffing has decreased 3% since FY1999 and 12% since FY2001.



Local Public Safety Coordinating Council


Coordination

In 1995, the State Legislature passed Senate Bill 1145 which significantly affected the public safety roles of the State and its 36 counties. The law declared that counties would provide punishment, sanctions, and services for all felony offenders under community supervision and all offenders sentenced or sanctioned to 12 months or less incarceration. It also called for counties to coordinate local criminal justice system policy.

Including the County Sheriff’s Office, there are eight different police agencies in Multnomah County. They are the cities of Portland, Gresham, Troutdale, and Fairview, the Oregon State Police, Port of Portland Police and the Oregon Liquor Control Commission. Arrests per 10,000 population have declined 10% since 1998. In 2001, reported arrests per 10,000 population in Multnomah County were 7% lower than the state as a whole.

Once arrested, the County District Attorney’s Office decides whether to prosecute, the County Sheriff’s Office manages the jail for those kept in custody, the defendant is sentenced by the

Reported Arrests per 10,000 Population



State Courts, and the sentence is administered by the State Department of Corrections or the County’s Department of Community Justice.

Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Inmates transported between jails and to court (SHERIFF)	83,883	79,633	73,654	69,031	58,217
Average length of jail stay in days (SHERIFF)	17.90	18.30	20.40	19.97	19.33
Youth admitted to detention center (DCJ)	3,940	2,913	2,816	2,611	2,357
Average length of stay in days in youth detention center (DCJ)	11.2	8.9	10.9	11.1	10.3
Cases prosecuted (DA)	22,041	23,154	21,246	19,895	22,390
Average youth on probation per month (DCJ)	850	735	704	660	606
Average adults on probation per month (DCJ)	6,928	7,033	6,800	5,839	5,597
Average adults on parole/post-prison supervision per month(DCJ)	3,270	3,641	3,803	3,203	3,574

Workload	CY1998	CY1999	CY2000	CY2001	CY2002
Felony cases resulting in probation ¹ (STATE COURTS)	4,111	4,164	4,126	3,481	2,624

¹Represents cases, not defendants; duplicated count.

Local Public Safety Coordinating Council


Coordination

The goals of the LPSCC are to:

- Protect, in order of priority, life, personal safety, and property.
- Reduce crime to the maximum extent possible.
- Protect and respect victims of crime.
- Increase the sense of safety, quality of life, and opportunity.
- Protect constitutional principles of fairness, equity, and due process.
- Change the future behavior of offenders by providing opportunities to return to the community as productive citizens.

The Auditor’s Office surveys residents annually about their feelings of personal safety. Perceptions about safety in their neighborhood during the day have remained the same. However, the percent of citizens who reported feeling somewhat or very safe in their neighborhood at night has declined by five percentage points from 78% to 73%.

Citizens Reporting Feeling Somewhat or Very Safe



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Successful completion of jail release programs (SHERIFF)					
Electronic monitoring	N/A	86%	86%	77%	82%
Close Street Supervision	80%	61%	68%	67%	70%
Felony warrants entered within time period (24 hours of issuance) (SHERIFF)	N/A	33%	50%	25%	42%
Misdemeanor warrants entered within time period (3 days of issuance) (SHERIFF)	N/A	58%	42%	92%	42%
Failure to appear for court rate	Measure Under Development				

Local Public Safety Coordinating Council

System Improvement


The LPSCC does the majority of its work through committees and working groups. The Council first worked on implementing an \$8 million bond-funded program to enhance criminal justice information technology. This work resulted in the development of the Data Support System for Justice (DSS-J), a database consisting of information from multiple justice systems to be used in policy analysis and decision making. Since then there have been working groups that looked at:

- People with mental illness in the criminal justice system
- Racial over-representation
- Juvenile justice delinquency prevention
- Domestic violence
- Alcohol and drug abuse and addiction
- Gang prevention
- Pre-trial policy
- Maintaining the quality of DSS-J

Drug Abuse and Addiction

Diversion is one way a public safety system can manage resources and still hold offenders accountable. Treatment is often a requirement of this opportunity to avoid conviction. In FY2003, approximately 1/3 of adult offenders on diversion successfully completed drug treatment.

Treatment Success Rate for Adult Offenders in Drug Diversion



Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Mental health clients on pretrial release				Measure Under Development	
Defendants with mental illness in Community Court				Measure Under Development	
Youth participating in delinquency prevention (diversion programs)DCJ	N/A	N/A	1,375	1,185	673
Adults served in alcohol and drug treatment court (DCJ)	N/A	N/A	N/A	627	828

System Improvement


Racial Over-Representation

In 2000, LPSCC issued a report on over-representation of racial and ethnic minorities in the public safety system. The analysis concluded that racial/ethnic minorities were over-represented at arrest, harsher sentences were most often applied to people of color, and African Americans were more often assessed at high risk to offend in the supervision process.

In 2003, LPSCC studied and reported on District Attorney sentence recommendations by completing a case file study which was recommended in the first report. The study showed no bias or racially unfair practices.

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention

In 1998, LPSCC developed a plan to reduce the number of youths entering the juvenile justice system and recidivism among violent, chronic, and serious juvenile offenders. Since CY1998, the number of juvenile offenders decreased 27% from 3,914 in 1998 to 2,865 offenders in 2001. The recidivism rate (return to criminal activity within one year) dropped from 32% in 1997 to 29% in 2001.



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Defendants with mental illness successfully completing Community Court supervision				Measure Under Development	

Overview


Accomplishments

- Maintained equal detention rates for youth of color and white youth
- Increased use of detention alternatives and reduced number of youth detained
- Continued to reduce juvenile offender recidivism
- Opened transitional housing program for adult offenders
- Recognized as innovative adult education program by US Dept. of Education
- Developed partnerships to provide culturally appropriate services to youth
- Strengthened adult sex offender supervision
- Reduced recidivism by using alcohol and drug treatment as a sanction

Issues

- Major reductions in state funding and continuing fiscal uncertainty
- Budget cuts reduced a number of programs, such as DUII services, juvenile and adult probation, the Community Justice Initiative, and adult alcohol and drug treatment

The Department of Community Justice (DCJ) works to keep communities safe and to reduce criminal recidivism. They hold adult and juvenile offenders accountable for their actions while also helping them develop the skills necessary for success in the community.




Department of Community Justice

Spending and Staffing

Spending


DCJ spent \$73 million on services in Fiscal Year 2003 (July 1, 2002–June 30, 2003), an increase of 7% over FY1999.

- \$109 was spent per county resident in FY2003.
- Approximately 54% of the Department’s funding came from local sources, with state, federal, and other sources accounting for the remainder in FY2003.
- Funding for juvenile programs has increased 9% in constant dollars over five years, while adult program funding increased 24%.
- In FY2003, 55% of the Department’s spending was for staffing.



Staffing

The number of hours worked by DCJ staff was equal to 603 full-time employees in FY2003. This is a decrease of 3% over five years, and a decrease of 12% from FY2001 staffing levels.




Department of Community Justice

Supervision and Sanctions

DCJ manages programs to sanction and supervise juvenile and adult offenders. 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 are responsible for assessing offenders' risk to the community, imposing sanctions when they don't comply, and making arrests when they threaten public safety. For juveniles, DCJ manages a regional detention center, community alternatives to detention, and secure treatment for juvenile sex offenders and those affected by alcohol and drug problems. The Department also runs programs for youth and adults that hold offenders accountable, such as community service, day reporting, and forest camp.


Juvenile Recidivism

The juvenile rate of recidivism (return to criminal activity within one year) has dropped slightly, with fewer than one out of every three offenders committing a new crime. While this is a small drop in the percentage of youth who reoffend, it represents a large number (1,409 in 1997 compared to 884 in 2001).



Adult Recidivism

The adult rate of recidivism (convicted for a new felony crime in the three-year period after supervision began) for offenders on parole/post-prison supervision has been consistently higher than for those on probation. Both probation and parole/post-prison supervision rates have risen slightly since FY2000.



Efficiency and Cost

Juvenile

Cost per bed day in detention (excluding treatment programs, adjusted for inflation)

Adult

Average cost per person per day on probation and parole/post-prison supervision (including treatment and programs, adjusted for inflation)

	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Cost per bed day in detention (excluding treatment programs, adjusted for inflation)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$250.43	\$268.90
Average cost per person per day on probation and parole/post-prison supervision (including treatment and programs, adjusted for inflation)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$9.17	\$8.78


¹The rate for 2002 will be available in early 2004 to allow 12 months to elapse between initial referral and any new criminal activity.

Department of Community Justice

Supervision and Sanctions


Juveniles Supervised

DCJ supervises all youth who are placed on probation by the Juvenile Court and who reside in the county. There were about 600 youth on probation at any given time in FY2003, down 29% from FY1999.



Adults Supervised

DCJ supervises probationers and those offenders who have served a sentence in jail or a state prison (parole/post-prison supervision). Approximately 9,200 adult offenders were supervised per month in FY2003, a 10% drop over five years.




Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Juvenile					
Intakes at the youth detention center	6,595	5,914	5,572	4,006	3,060
Admissions to the youth detention center	3,940	2,913	2,816	2,611	2,357
Average length of stay in youth detention (in days)	11.2	8.9	10.9	11.1	10.3
Participants in accountability programs					
Forest Project	570	599	647	544	510
Project Payback (restitution)	2,178	1,641	1,354	1,337	1,292
Community Service	2,357	1,959	1,601	1,464	1,110
Day Reporting Center			New Program	626	422
Adult					
Average time spent on probation (in months)	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.3	29.9
Average time spent on parole/post-prison supervision (in months)	N/A	N/A	N/A	27.7	29.4
Sanctions imposed for violations of probation or parole/post-prison supervision	4,758	5,295	5,501	5,435	4,362
Recognizance interviews conducted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15,674
Pretrial release clients supervised	3,664	3,015	2,921	2,636	2,385
Participants in accountability programs					
Forest Project	493	565	512	481	378
Community Service	N/A	5,550	4,939	4,837	4,734
Day Reporting Center	445	334	553	739	702


Department of Community Justice

Supervision and Sanctions

A sample of youth who spent time in detention or who were on probation are surveyed each year to assess their experience with juvenile justice. The percent who report that they were treated respectfully by staff has been very high over four years, with a decrease for Probation Counselors in FY2002 and a gain for Detention staff in that year.



Another measure of effective supervision is the percent of probation and parole/post-prison supervision cases that are successful at closure. A positive case closure is one in which the offender has successfully fulfilled the terms of his or her probation or parole orders.



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Juvenile					
Youth in custody who increase knowledge of skills that prevent future criminal activity	N/A	N/A	83%	81%	71%
Community service hours completed	14,142	11,754	9,606	10,117	7,672
Total restitution paid	N/A	N/A	\$70,757	\$78,874	\$80,423
Adult					
Clients on pretrial supervision who fail to appear for court	23%	22%	17%	18%	19%
Community service hours completed	105,774	N/A	117,890	127,439	122,391
Percent of sanctions that are non-jail	43%	35%	36%	35%	30%
Total restitution paid	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,234,088	\$1,283,351

² Survey was not conducted in FY2003. No data on detention staff for FY1999.


³ No juvenile or adult data available prior to FY2001 and no adult data available for FY2003.

Department of Community Justice

Prevention and Intervention

DCJ provides services that help prevent crime and future criminal behavior. For example:

- Staff work with at-risk families and youth to help steer youth away from delinquent behavior and intervene early with those youth already involved with the juvenile court.
- The Department works with adults who are transitioning out of jail and prison to minimize the risk to communities and improve their chances of becoming contributing members of those communities. This includes assistance with education, employment, housing, and basic needs.



Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Juvenile					
Youth participating in delinquency prevention (diversion programs)	N/A	N/A	1,375	1,185	673
Families participating in mediation and custody evaluation services	1,458	1,619	1,507	1,391	1,214
Youth and families participating in skill development programs	418	343	N/A	368	175
Adult					
Adults provided with transitional services (bus tickets, ID, clothing, work supplies, etc.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,761	2,615
Special needs clients receiving transitional services (case management, housing placement, medical assistance, etc.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,332	2,009
Adults participating in educational classes	519	446	531	567	596
Inmates contacted prior to release from prison ⁴	N/A	N/A	N/A	209	633
Hours of GED study provided	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,473	3,936

⁴ Represents Transitional Services Unit only.


Department of Community Justice

Prevention and Intervention

One example of prevention and intervention effort is juvenile diversion. This program works with low-risk offenders in a way that allows them to stay out of the formal court system, but still holds them accountable for their behaviors. Eligible youth work with counselors on fulfilling sanctions that can include mediation with the victim, community service, restitution, classes related to the law violation, or more intensive services.

Over the past five years, the number of youth participating in diversion has fluctuated, although the rate of positive case closures has remained stable at about 82%. The recidivism rate for the program has remained fairly constant at about 20% between 1999 and 2001.

Recidivism Rate for Delinquency Intervention (Diversion) Programs ⁵



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Juvenile					
Delinquency prevention (diversion) case closures that are positive	N/A	N/A	82%	81%	82%
Youth reporting improved school attendance while on probation	53%	56%	63%	61%	N/A ⁶
Satisfaction with custody and parenting mediation services	Measure Under Development				
Adult					
Clients placed in transitional housing	N/A	N/A	1,061	938	1,027
Clients receiving GEDs	64	49	66	95	73

⁵ The recidivism rate for 2002 will be available in early 2004 to allow 12 months to elapse between initial referral and any new criminal activity.

⁶ Survey was not conducted in FY2003.


Department of Community Justice

Treatment and Rehabilitation

DCJ also provides a number of services that treat underlying problems contributing to criminal behavior. These include alcohol and drug treatment, mental health assessment and care, sex offender treatment, and anger management. They also provide specialized supervision to offenders with gang affiliations, multiple substance and mental health problems, and those convicted of drunk driving, domestic violence, and sex abuse.

Treatment and rehabilitation services are provided by contractors in community-based setting and in detention for those offenders who require a more secure setting for treatment.

Youth Served in Secure (Detention) Programs




Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Juvenile					
Youth served in home-based family treatment		New Program		46	52
Adult					
Residential alcohol and drug treatment episodes ⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A	498	671
Outpatient alcohol and drug treatment episodes ⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A	946	1,540
Alcohol and drug treatment episodes for drug court programs ⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A	706	1,194
Mental health treatment episodes ⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A	127	264
Average clients in specialized caseloads per month (gang members, domestic violence, women, etc)	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,730	3,343

⁷ Services are provided through contracts with community-based treatment agencies.

Treatment and Rehabilitation


Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment Success

The sex offender treatment program is designed to reduce recidivism by providing assessments, supervision, and comprehensive family treatment. Part of the program is provided at the detention center. Success is determined by completion of the majority of treatment goals and placement in a less intensive program. The success rate has been stable at approximately 75% over the last five years.



Adult Alcohol and Drug Treatment Success

Alcohol and drug treatment are intended to reduce the risk that an offender will commit new crimes. Clients may need more than one treatment episode to succeed. The success rate for adult offender alcohol and drug treatment in residential settings rose from 56% in FY1999 to remain stable at around 66% for the last four years. Success rates for outpatient treatment have fallen from 55% in FY1999 to 36% in FY2003.



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Juvenile					
Residential alcohol and drug treatment success rate					
Home-based family treatment success rate				35%	61%
Adult					
Success rate for mental health case management services ⁸	N/A	N/A	N/A	79%	75%
Treatment success rate for drug diversion services ⁸	N/A	N/A	N/A	36%	34%

⁸ Services are provided through contracts with community-based treatment agencies.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Page Intentionally Blank

Overview


Accomplishments

- Opened a fourth Community Court in Gresham
- Named by the U.S. Dept. of Justice for the third time as a leadership site for combating quality of life crimes
- Indicted 614 cases in 2003 for Ballot Measure 11 crimes, the most serious felony cases
- Neighborhood DA Unit developed community-driven search warrants to help police close down drug houses

Issues

- Maintain core services despite continuing County and State budget cuts
- Identity theft and property crimes increasingly require more resources

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 activities; innovative community programs; public education about the law; and fair and consistent application of the law.



District Attorney's Office

Spending and Staffing


Spending

The District Attorney's Office spent \$18.3 million on services in Fiscal Year 2003 (July 1, 2002 – June 30, 2003), an increase of 11% since FY1999 and a 3% decrease since FY2002.

- \$27 was spent per county resident in FY2003.
- Approximately 73% of the Office's funding came from local sources.
- Funding from state and federal government sources accounted for 25% of the total.
- In FY2003, almost 82% of the Office's expenditure was for personnel.

District Attorney's Office Spending

(In millions, Adjusted for Inflation)




Staffing

The number of hours worked by District Attorney's Office employees was equal to 209 full-time employees in FY2003. This is a decrease of 3% over five years, but a steeper drop over the last three.

District Attorney Staffing

(Full-Time Equivalent Employees)




District Attorney's Office

Prosecution and Victim Advocacy

The District Attorney's Office reviews all crimes presented by law enforcement agencies and has jurisdiction to prosecute all crimes involving adults and juveniles that occur in Multnomah County. When necessary, the Office provides follow-up investigation on the more serious crimes.

To address specific or regional crime areas, the Office participates in numerous tasks forces such as the Youth Gun Anti-Violence Task Force, Regional Organized Crime and Narcotics Task Force, Auto Theft Task Force, and Anti-terrorism Task Force.

The Office also provides legal information and support to those who have been victimized in a criminal act. Through the Victims' Assistance Program, victims of crime can receive crisis intervention services, assistance with and information on the criminal prosecution process, and information and referral services.



Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Cases of adult criminal activity reviewed					
Person crime cases	7,639	8,276	7,877	7,545	7,697
Property crime cases	10,482	10,573	10,361	9,823	10,326
Behavioral crime cases	12,140	13,635	12,617	11,107	13,774
Juvenile delinquency cases reviewed	N/A	Incomplete	2,630	2,056	1,842
Cases of adult criminal activity prosecuted					
Person crime cases	3,356	3,237	3,283	3,184	3,528
Property crime cases	7,663	8,004	7,428	7,358	7,561
Behavioral crime cases	11,022	11,913	10,535	9,353	11,301
Juvenile delinquency cases prosecuted	N/A	Incomplete	1,845	1,486	1,332

District Attorney's Office

Prosecution and Victim Advocacy


Case Outcomes

A case can be concluded in several ways. A defendant can plead guilty, be found guilty by the court or jury, or plead no contest (not dispute the charges). A case can also end in acquittal (not guilty), be found guilty but for insanity, or be dismissed for a variety of reasons. Dismissals include defendants who plead guilty to another case and those who enter diversion programs. Of those adult cases concluded in FY2003:

- 1% of all cases ended in acquittal
- 23% of all cases ended in dismissal
- 72% of felony cases ended in conviction
- 77% of misdemeanor cases ended in conviction

Management states that reductions in court operations and lack of funding for defense representation forced policy changes in the DA's Office. Two policy changes that had a significant impact involved reducing low level felony crimes to misdemeanors and reducing selected misdemeanors to violations. This resulted in a decrease in felony behavioral crime convictions and an increase in misdemeanor crime convictions.

Adult Felony and Misdemeanor Convictions
(Percent of Concluded Cases)



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Concluded cases ending in conviction for all adult felony cases					
Felony person crimes	80%	79%	80%	73%	68%
Felony property crimes	86%	82%	86%	84%	82%
Felony behavioral crimes	80%	80%	83%	80%	69%
Concluded cases ending in conviction for all adult misdemeanor cases					
Misdemeanor person crimes	73%	68%	66%	67%	70%
Misdemeanor property crimes	75%	74%	72%	67%	76%
Misdemeanor behavioral crimes	69%	70%	67%	68%	79%

District Attorney's Office

Prosecution and Victim Advocacy

Victims' Assistance Program

The Victims' Assistance Program (VAP) provides information, support, and advocacy to crime victims throughout the prosecution process.

VAP uses a network of over 60 volunteers to help victims of sexual assault. Volunteers respond to the hospital after regular business hours, enabling the DA's Office to serve victims 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In 2002, volunteers responded to the hospital 86 times to assist sexual assault victims.


In FY2003, VAP initiated a survey of victims assisted by the program in order to assess the quality and effectiveness of VAP services. Four of the survey questions were selected to be included in the Service Efforts and Accomplishments report. Response results are shown in the table below.

(Please note: the VAP survey was implemented in January 2003. Results shown below do not represent a full year of responses.)

Restitution and Compensation

The District Attorney's Office recommends to the court that defendants be ordered to repay victims for their losses through restitution. VAP assists victims to file restitution claims. VAP also helps victims apply for compensation to assist with payment of medical bills, counseling costs, and funeral and burial costs. \$805,251 was ordered in compensation during FY2002 and \$790,909 during FY2003.

Amount of Restitution Ordered for Crime Victims
(In Millions)



Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Adult cases reviewed with victim advocates assigned	3,122	3,639	4,077	3,218	3,128

Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Of those victims responding to the following VAP survey questions the percent reporting:					
Satisfaction with the Victims Assistance Program (VAP)				New Measure	75%
VAP helped them participate in the court and prosecution processes				New Measure	76%
VAP advocates were sympathetic to their situation, feelings, and experience				New Measure	72%
VAP advocates returned their calls within 24 hours				New Measure	60%

District Attorney's Office

Intervention and Protection

Family Justice


Family justice is a high priority of the District Attorney's Office. Towards that effort, staff legally intervenes to protect abused and neglected children. Cases can include conflicts between parents and children that can be resolved quickly, children who need protection because parents are involved in criminal activity, or children who are victims of abuse and/or neglect. When appropriate, the Office will work with the Oregon Department of Human Services to free children for adoption through the court. The Office also participates on a multi-agency team to review, investigate, and prosecute child abuse cases.

Intervention and Protection Options


Other ways the Office intervenes and protects include enforcing child support orders and offering treatment options as an alternative at sentencing.

The DA's Office also represents the public in civil commitment hearings. These are hearings conducted in cases where persons present a danger to themselves or others because of mental illness.

Cases of Abused, Neglected, and Abandoned Children Needing Protection



Commitment Hearings for Persons with Mental Illness



Workload

	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Protected children freed for adoption	310	242	144	147	147
Child support cases reviewed	N/A	8,341	8,404	8,413	8,546
Drug offenders accepting treatment and recovery opportunities	N/A	N/A	N/A	127	545 ¹

¹Reflects the addition of a second treatment program midway through FY2002


District Attorney's Office

Intervention and Protection

Diversion

With diversion, adults or youth who have committed certain crimes are held accountable and offered an opportunity to avoid criminal conviction. These offenders are obligated to meet several conditions to avoid conviction. This usually includes treatment. Management states that the increase in domestic violence defendants participating in deferred sentencing (see table below) is a result of the efforts of the Family Violence Coordinating Committee, which includes the DA's Office.


Juvenile Offenders Referred to Diversion Programs and Receiving Services²



Child Support

The District Attorney's Office helps many parents in Multnomah County establish paternity, create and modify a support order, and collect support for children. These efforts assist children in need, improve family self-sufficiency, return money to the public treasury, and reduce the costs of providing public assistance. In FY2003, \$29.4 million was collected, an 8% increase from FY1999.

Total Child Support Collected (In Millions)




Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Domestic violence defendants referred and accepting deferred sentencing	49%	49%	50%	75%	75%
Resolution time per case for abused, neglected, and abandoned children (average number of days)	N/A	209	206	207	N/A
Resolution time per case for children freed for adoption (average number of days)	N/A	231	256	206	N/A

² Represents only those juvenile delinquency cases referred to the DA's Office for formal screening.

Community-Based Strategies

Neighborhood District Attorney Boundaries



The Neighborhood DA (NDA) Unit works closely with police and community members to reduce or eliminate community safety problems. The NDA Unit has helped reduce problems of drug sales, thefts from cars, illegal camping, and other quality of life offenses within Multnomah County. The program covers all neighborhoods in the county and the public transit system. Budget cuts during FY2003 resulted in fewer prosecutors being assigned to the Unit, a realignment of NDA boundaries, and some changes to service functions.



The Community Court Project (CC) is intended to be a fast, effective, and neighborhood-based method to sanction and support misdemeanor offenders. Community courts strive to reduce quality of life crimes by sentencing low-level offenders to perform community service in the neighborhoods where they committed their crimes and by providing social service assistance when needed. In FY2003, a fourth court opened in Gresham, making it possible for all misdemeanor offenses committed in Multnomah County to be arraigned in Community Court. State and County budget cuts also had an impact on CC operations. The North/Northeast Portland and Southeast Portland CCs were re-located from those neighborhoods to the downtown Justice Center, and the number of offenses eligible for CC expanded.

Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Misdemeanor cases reviewed by the Neighborhood DA Unit		New Measure		7,078	9,295
Defendants appearing in Community Court	466	538	1,039	4,012	4,292
Cases resolved in Community Court		New Measure		5,735	6,131

Community-Based Strategies

Community Service

Community Court defendants, who are ordered to complete community service, work on a supervised work crew. The addition of three Community Courts since FY1999 accounts for the sharp increase in the number sentenced to community service by Community Court and the estimated value of the work performed as a result (calculated using Oregon's \$6.90 per hour minimum wage).



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Community Court cases with completed community service	274	240	777	1,765	2,601
Community Court cases sentenced to community service that completed community service	79%	62%	53%	55%	76%
Hours of community service completed	2,719	3,064	11,516	25,598	28,441

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Page Intentionally Blank

Sheriff's Office

Overview


Accomplishments

- Started using the Courthouse holding cells for persons serving day sentences
- Transitioned to a new administration in the middle of mid-year budget cuts
- Began operation of a Mobile Booking Unit for booking during unusual or major events, such as riots
- Joined others to implement a system allowing victims to determine if someone is in custody or not (VINE)

Issues

- Dealing with fluctuating financial resources causing staff lay-offs, service cuts, and fewer jail beds
- Changing construction and incurring construction cost increases at Wapato Jail once 325 treatment beds were eliminated
- Not having operating levy funds for opening Wapato as originally planned
- Adjusting to the impacts that have occurred due to state budget cuts in the courts, indigent defense, and state police

The vision of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office is "Exemplary public service for a safe, livable community."



Sheriff's Office

Spending and Staffing



Spending

The Sheriff's Office spent 88.02 million on services in FY2003 (June 1, 2002 – June 30, 2003), a decrease of 1% since FY1999 and a 5% decrease since FY2002.

- \$164 dollars were spent per county resident in FY2003.
- Approximately 67% of the Office's funding came from local tax sources, with state and federal sources accounting for most of the remainder.
- The state and federal portion of the Sheriff's Office funding grew from 19% in FY1999 to 29% in FY2003. Fees and miscellaneous revenues account for 4%.
- In FY2003, 80% of the expenditure was for personnel.

Staffing

The number of hours worked by Sheriff's Office employees was equal to 851 full-time positions in FY2003. This is a decrease of 3% since FY1999, but a drop of 11% from FY2001.





Sheriff's Office

Corrections

The Sheriff's Office operates three jail facilities in Multnomah County. Corrections Facilities and Programs incarcerate sentenced offenders and those awaiting trial. The Division also manages work crew and community monitoring programs and provides programs to help inmates before they are released back into the community.

Since FY1999, the number of bookings has decreased by 22%. The length of time that offenders are in jail has increased by 8% from FY1999 to FY2003, but has declined slightly from its high in FY2001. According to the Sheriff's Office, this could be due to changed booking policies. Also, as beds are reduced, people who remain in jail may be those whose crimes are more serious.

The number of jail beds available appears to strongly correlate with the average daily population in the jails. How many jail beds are available may affect how the County and public safety system responds to offenders.



Workload

	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Inmates transported between jails and to court	83,883	79,633	73,654	69,031	58,217
Inmates participating in life skills programs	5,818	10,302	24,112 ¹	20,665 ¹	10,147
Inmates attending GED classes	1,593	1,363	1,495	994	1,013
Records processed	365,495	377,014	329,433	319,953	303,958

¹Increase represents change in program operations


Sheriff's Office

Corrections

Jail Conditions

In 1999, all thirty-six Oregon Sheriffs approved jail standards. The FY2002 Multnomah County Detention Center (MCDC) audit was a comparison of the facility's written policies against the Oregon Sheriffs' Jail Standards. A second audit in FY2003 at MCDC and Multnomah County Inverness Jail concerned jail operations. In reviewing policies and operations for MCDC, the Sheriff's Office met full compliance on more than 90% of the 466 policy and 465 operation standards.


Compliance with Oregon Sheriff's Jail Standards
(MCDC only)



Restitution to the Community

In FY2003, inmates in Multnomah County jail facilities contributed an estimated \$4,728,800 back to the community through disciplinary fines and fees, probation and treatment fees, room and board, direct restitution to victims, and work crew labor.

Estimated Value of Work Crew Labor and Payments



Results

	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Escapes from jail	0	0	0	0	0
Inmate walk-aways from work crew	0	3	2	0	3
Inmate walk-aways from Restitution Center	29	64	58	70	26 ²
Major inmate disturbances or incidents (per bed)	.10	N/A	N/A	.024	.009
Successful completion of non-custody electronic monitoring programs	N/A	86%	86%	77%	82%
Successful completion of non-custody Close Street Supervision Program	80%	61%	68%	67%	70%
Felony warrants entered within time period (24 hours of issuance)	N/A	33%	50%	25%	42%
Misdemeanor warrants entered within time period (3 days of issuance)	N/A	58%	42%	92%	42%

²Based on 6 months data – MCRC closed January 15, 2003.



Corrections

Number of Jail Beds

The number of jail beds per capita has declined by 17% since FY1999. A new facility will be completed in June 2004. According to the Sheriff's Office, however, the number of jail beds will not be increased unless new funding resources are found.


While the number of jail beds per 1,000 residents has declined, compared to other similar counties, Multnomah County is second highest.

The cost of a jail bed per day in Multnomah County is approximately \$110. When controlling for inflation, this is a 1.1% decrease since FY1999.



Sheriff's Office

Law Enforcement



The Sheriff's Office is responsible for policing unincorporated Multnomah County. The cities of Maywood Park and Wood Village also contract with the Sheriff for policing. The service area is 289 square miles or 66% of the land area in Multnomah County, but represents only 2% of the county population. On a county-wide basis, the Enforcement Division patrols 95 miles of rivers; inspects for hazardous material; inspects for truck safety; provides community and school-based programs; and investigates major regional crimes in collaboration with other agencies; and provides mid-level narcotic trafficking enforcement through the Special Investigations Unit (SIU).

Workload	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Responses to calls for services	N/A	36,346	37,414	36,063	36,972
Incidents dispatched from central dispatch agency (BOEC)	N/A	6,948	7,489	8,435	8,273
Incidents officer initiated	N/A	29,398	29,925	27,628	28,699
Water safety classes (local schools and adults)	N/A	52	73	13	10


Sheriff's Office

Law Enforcement

Patrol Services


The Sheriff's Office has a force of 26 uniformed patrol officers, approximately 1.6 per 1,000 residents of unincorporated county, Wood Village, and Maywood Park.

Compared to three other counties similar in land area, population, and law enforcement operations, the County's number of patrol officers per 1,000 residents was in the middle. While Multnomah County had a decrease, two other counties had increases. Also, the Sheriff's Office must patrol two areas divided by the City of Portland. None of the other jurisdictions had this characteristic.



Dispatched Calls per Patrol Officer

All emergency services in Multnomah County are dispatched by a centralized city agency, the Bureau of Emergency Communications. When area residents call 911 for any type of emergency, the call is taken and dispatched from the Communications Center operated by the City of Portland.



Results

Major (Part I) offenses cleared by an arrest
 Offenses cleared
 Resolution of all cases assigned to the Special Investigations Unit
 Sent to District Attorney
 Indicted
 Cases indicted that are found guilty
 Juvenile crime arrests as a percent of total Part I and Part II arrests

	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Major (Part I) offenses cleared by an arrest	N/A	9.2%	8.8%	16%	15% ³
Offenses cleared	N/A	45.7%	39.4%	44.1%	46.4% ³
Resolution of all cases assigned to the Special Investigations Unit					
Sent to District Attorney	N/A	82	125	131	83
Indicted		69.5%	93.6%	78%	55%
Cases indicted that are found guilty		75.4%	70.9%	81%	93%
Juvenile crime arrests as a percent of total Part I and Part II arrests	N/A	15.6%	15.1%	20%	12%

³Based on 6 months of data only.

Law Enforcement

Crime Rate


The rate of serious crimes (Part I) against people and property in unincorporated Multnomah County and the contract cities of Maywood Park and Wood Village was 47 crimes per 1,000 residents in FY2003. Examples of serious crimes are homicide, rape, robbery, and kidnapping. This rate declined from FY2001 by 12%.

Part II crimes are "lesser crimes" such as drug crimes, simple assault, fraud, weapons violations, prostitution, gambling, drunk driving, disorderly conduct, child abuse, and curfew violations. Crimes of this type decreased to 120 per 1,000 residents in FY2003.


Response Time for Rural Multnomah County

The chart below shows response time to crimes where life or physical health is at serious risk of harm, or where a major property crime is in progress. On average, Sheriff's Deputies responded to emergency or high priority calls more quickly on the Eastside than on the Westside. Response times were on average 16.1 minutes on the Westside and 12.8 minutes on the Eastside in FY2003.

Crime Rate per 1,000 Residents



Average Response Time to Priority Calls (In Minutes)




Court Services

The Sheriff's Office provides a variety of services to the State Courts located in Multnomah County

- Provide security for the courthouses and courtrooms by monitoring access, providing physical security, and escorting and transporting inmates to and from the buildings
- Enforce civil court orders
- Serve notice of process in civil lawsuits
- Provide for care, custody, and transportation of alleged mentally ill persons

Percent of Persons Located and Successfully Served
(Notice of Civil Process or Protective Orders)



Results	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003
Weapons seized at court houses	5,403	8,423	4,475	1,353	1,750
Inmates held for court at Courthouse	14,319	14,133	14,334	13,558	13,545
Civil Commitment Hearings of allegedly Mentally Ill Persons (monthly average)					
Hearings with security provided	N/A	54	47	50	45
Inmates transported to court	N/A	44	41	44	38
Inmates transported to a facility after commitment	N/A	36	33	35	29

[Return to Table of Contents](#)


Page Intentionally Blank

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.

Many of the County's services are located throughout the county to allow easier access to citizens who need them. Services are provided in schools, non-profit programs, senior centers, branch offices, churches, clinics, and cultural and family centers. The Library has 16 branches, the Central Library in downtown Portland, and the Title Wave Used Bookstore. In the social and health services system each department has geographically dispersed locations to better serve citizens.

To analyze the survey data, we looked at citizen responses county-wide and by service district. The service district boundaries were based on the former Department of Community and Family Services service boundaries. These are also closely aligned with the Department of County Human Services and Health Department service boundaries.

Survey Districts




Citizen Survey

Respondent Demographics


There were several questions on the citizen survey that related to individual or household characteristics. From this we learned that, of those who responded:

- 20% lived in the county 5 years or less and 32% more than 30 years. More citizens in the West and Southeast Districts lived there 5 years or less and more citizens in the North and Mid-County Districts lived there more than 30 years.
- West and East districts had a higher percentage of citizens that work over 40 hours per week (20% each).
- The West district had the highest percentage of citizens that made over \$59,000 (54%). North and Southeast districts had the highest percentages of citizens that were living at the poverty threshold or below (18% each). Service districts were similar in the number of respondents with a household income between the poverty threshold and median income (approximately 1/3 of all respondents).
- Most citizens (85%) rated themselves as having good, very good, or excellent health.
- 34% had some or a great deal of limited activity due to their physical health or functioning, an increase of 8% since FY2001.
- 16% had some or a great deal of limited activity due to their emotional or mental health problems, a 2% increase from FY2001.

**Average Household Income by Service District
FY2003**



**Years Respondent Has Lived in Neighborhood
FY2003**




Citizen Survey

Animal Services


The mission of the Animal Services Division is to protect people and animals through the promotion and enforcement of responsible animal ownership. The Field Services program is responsible for providing timely response and effective resolution to animal-related emergencies and neighborhood problems involving animal ownership. Barking dogs and animals running loose are the most common respondent complaints.

This year, fewer respondents identified a problem with a vicious animal in their neighborhood (6%). Despite the problems of barking dogs (18%) and loose animals (28%) in neighborhoods, only 9% had reported a problem to Animal Services. Of the 146 respondents who had reported a problem to Animal Services, only 42% were somewhat or very satisfied with the service they received compared to 58% in FY2002. However, there has been an overall decrease in the percentage of respondents reporting problems with animals in their neighborhoods.

**Respondents Having Problems with Barking Dogs
FY2003**



**Respondent Problems with Animals in their
Neighborhood**



Citizen Survey	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	Percent Change from FY2001
Reported a problem with barking dogs in neighborhood	30%	17%	18%	-40%
Reported a problem with animals running loose in neighborhood	34%	25%	28%	-18%
Reported a problem with a vicious animal in neighborhood	9%	7%	6%	-33%

Citizen Survey

Library


Accessing Library Services

The percent of respondents accessing the Library by computer (24%) is only slightly lower than those accessing the Library by telephone (25%). The gap between those accessing the Library by computer and telephone has decreased from 7% in FY2001 to 1% in FY2003.


Satisfaction With Library Services

Although overall satisfaction with Library services has declined somewhat, they are still rated highly. Libraries were also rated highly for location, assistance from Library staff, and children’s programs.

**Respondents Accessing Library
FY2003**



Respondents Very Satisfied with Overall Library Services



Citizen Survey

	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	Percent Change from FY2001
Percent very satisfied with hours library is open	59%	51%	50%	-15%
Percent very satisfied with location	75%	76%	79%	+5%
Percent very satisfied with availability of books and materials	58%	57%	54%	-7%
Percent very satisfied with assistance provided by library staff	79%	77%	77%	-3%
Percent very satisfied with children’s programs	70%	70%	69%	-1%


Citizen Survey

Access to County Services

Telephone Information Referral

Since November 2000, the City of Portland and Multnomah County have shared one Information and Referral (I&R) telephone number. The purpose of combining I&R functions is to increase accessibility for citizens. With one contact number, citizens do not need to know which services are City and which are County. Of the respondents that were aware of the I&R function, 29% had used it in the past year.


Respondents Aware of the City/County Information and Referral Telephone Number (503-823-4000)



Web page

In FY2003, a higher percent of respondents had used the Multnomah County web page (16%) than the I&R telephone number (7%). Furthermore, there appears to be a positive correlation between awareness of the web page and which income category the respondent reported.

Respondents Aware of the Multnomah County Web Page



Citizen Survey	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	Percent Change from FY2001
Percent who attempted to find out about or use any City or County service	28%	24%	30%	+7%
Percent who used City/County Telephone Information and Referral Number	9%	9%	7%	-22%
Percent with access to the Internet either from home or other location	75%	75%	77%	+3%
Percent who knew the County had a web page	38%	53%	55%	+45%


Citizen Survey

Sense of Safety

Feeling Safe Walking in the Neighborhood

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.


Most people surveyed reported feeling fairly safe walking alone in their neighborhood during the day; however, respondents in Mid-County felt noticeably less safe at night.



Problems in the Neighborhood

The County provides programs to help families and communities deal with social problems. In particular, the County assists low-income families dealing with problems such as drug and alcohol problems, domestic abuse, homelessness, and reintegration of criminal offenders into communities.

East County was the only neighborhood reporting an increase in a problem with graffiti. The West and North neighborhoods reported the largest decrease.



Citizen Survey


	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	Percent Change from FY2001
Percent who agree they can count on adults in the neighborhood to watch out that children are safe	85%	86%	86%	+1%
Percent who had a problem with children not being in school during the day	17%	19%	19%	+12%
Percent who identified a problem with fighting in their neighborhood	16%	16%	16%	0%
Percent who had problems with alcohol or drug abuse in their neighborhood	36%	32%	33%	-8%
Percent who had problems with children hanging around	18%	16%	16%	-11%
Percent who were aware of homeless adults in their neighborhood	24%	22%	24%	0%
Percent who were aware of homeless children in their neighborhood	4%	2%	3%	-25%

Sense of Community

Community Building

While local governments provide programs to improve neighborhood livability, they are limited by personal and community motivation. With few exceptions, government can only assist those who will accept or seek assistance. Often neighbors can provide assistance when government is not accessed.


Respondents in each of the service districts clearly feel their neighbors would be willing to help each other.



Community-Based Services

One of the ways Multnomah County programs attempt to more effectively deliver services is by showing a presence in communities. The County has school-based programs, senior centers, and family centers located throughout the County. The County wants citizens to be aware of its presence and to be accessible to those who need services.

Respondents living in the West service district felt strongest that their neighborhood is a good place for them to live.



Citizen Survey	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	Percent Change from FY2001
Percent who strongly agree or agree there is a sense of community	78%	80%	77%	-1%
Percent who strongly agree or agree people move in and out of the neighborhood a lot	36%	34%	35%	-3%
Percent who strongly agree or agree if children were doing something wrong neighbors would do something about it	78%	84%	82%	+5%
Percent who strongly agree or agree adults in the community know the kids	69%	76%	72%	+4%
Percent who strongly agree or agree very few of their neighbors know them	51%	48%	48%	-6%
Percent who strongly agree or agree they can recognize most of the people on their block	81%	83%	80%	-1%
Percent who strongly agree or agree they regularly stop and talk with the people in their neighborhood	73%	76%	73%	0%

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Page Intentionally Blank

Citizen Survey

In the spring of 2003, 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 15,000 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 the former Department of Community and Family Services service district boundaries. In total, 1,595 interviews were completed. A total of 20,196 calls were made to 14,096 telephone numbers. Of the 14,096 telephone numbers, 4,145 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 of 2,527 eligible households were contacted. Of those, 1,595 completed the interview and 932 refused to be interviewed. This yields an interview completion or response rate of 63%.

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 +/- 2.1%.

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
ANIMAL CONTROL									
Q1A - In the past year, have you had any problems in your neighborhood with barking dogs?									
No	81%	82%	82%	80%	82%	83%	82%	82%	70%
Yes	19%	18%	18%	20%	18%	17%	18%	18%	30%
	(250)	(251)	(274)	(264)	(303)	(252)	(1,594)	(1,985)	(1,502)
Q1B - In the past year, have you had any problems in your neighborhood with animals running loose?									
No	77%	68%	69%	74%	71%	73%	72%	75%	66%
Yes	23%	32%	31%	26%	29%	27%	28%	25%	34%
	(250)	(251)	(272)	(263)	(303)	(252)	(1,591)	(1,988)	(1,502)
Q1C - In the past year, have you had any problems in your neighborhood with a vicious animal?									
No	91%	91%	93%	96%	97%	93%	93%	93%	91%
Yes	9%	9%	7%	4%	3%	7%	7%	7%	9%
	(249)	(250)	(273)	(263)	(303)	(252)	(1,590)	(1,984)	(1,498)
Q1D - In the past year, have you reported an animal problem in your neighborhood to Multnomah County Animal Services?									
No	92%	90%	88%	93%	92%	90%	91%	91%	90%
Yes	8%	10%	12%	7%	8%	10%	9%	9%	10%
	(250)	(251)	(274)	(262)	(303)	(252)	(1,592)	(1,987)	(1,503)
Q1E - Thinking about the last time you called Multnomah County Animal Services, how satisfied were you with the service you received?									
Very dissatisfied	45%	41%	34%	29%	33%	46%	38%	27%	32%
Somewhat dissatisfied	30%	21%	16%	24%	8%	23%	20%	18%	14%
Somewhat satisfied	10%	17%	22%	18%	21%	23%	19%	24%	25%
Very satisfied	15%	21%	28%	29%	38%	8%	23%	31%	29%
	(20)	(24)	(32)	(17)	(24)	(26)	(143)	(160)	(146)

	2003							Prior Year TOTALS	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
LIBRARY									
Q2A - In the past 12 months, have you visited a Multnomah County library?									
No	37%	52%	35%	33%	42%	44%	41%	40%	37%
Yes	63%	48%	65%	67%	58%	56%	59%	60%	63%
	(249)	(251)	(274)	(264)	(303)	(252)	(1,593)	(1,987)	(1,502)
<i>Thinking about the Multnomah County library you usually go to . . .</i>									
Q2B - In general, how satisfied are you with the hours it is open?									
Very dissatisfied	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	9%	7%	8%	11%	6%	5%	8%	8%	7%
Somewhat satisfied	44%	42%	43%	40%	39%	40%	41%	40%	32%
Very satisfied	46%	50%	48%	48%	54%	54%	50%	50%	59%
	(156)	(120)	(178)	(172)	(171)	(138)	(935)	(1,177)	(932)
Q2C - In general, how satisfied are you with its location?									
Very dissatisfied	1%	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Somewhat satisfied	20%	25%	17%	15%	24%	15%	20%	22%	21%
Very satisfied	78%	73%	82%	83%	73%	83%	79%	76%	75%
	(156)	(120)	(178)	(174)	(172)	(139)	(939)	(1,178)	(936)
Q2D - In general, how satisfied are you with the availability of books and materials?									
Very dissatisfied	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6%	8%	7%	12%	7%	7%	9%	7%	7%
Somewhat satisfied	34%	49%	37%	35%	33%	38%	37%	34%	33%
Very satisfied	59%	41%	55%	51%	59%	53%	53%	56%	58%
	(155)	(120)	(178)	173)	(170)	(134)	(930)	(1,175)	(926)

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q2E - In general, how satisfied are you with the assistance provided by library staff?									
Very dissatisfied	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%
Somewhat satisfied	17%	20%	23%	18%	21%	23%	21%	21%	18%
Very satisfied	82%	79%	74%	79%	77%	74%	77%	76%	79%
	(152)	(118)	(175)	(167)	(166)	(136)	(914)	(1,150)	(917)
Q2F - In general, how satisfied are you with the children's programs?									
Very dissatisfied	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	-	4%	7%	-	-	2%	2%	3%	2%
Somewhat satisfied	30%	28%	29%	32%	36%	13%	28%	27%	26%
Very satisfied	70%	68%	64%	67%	64%	83%	69%	69%	69%
	(53)	(53)	(63)	(60)	(61)	(54)	(344)	(464)	(386)
Q2G - In the past 12 months, have you contacted the Multnomah County library by telephone?									
No	70%	80%	70%	76%	78%	80%	76%	75%	70%
Yes	30%	20%	30%	24%	22%	20%	24%	25%	30%
	(249)	(251)	(272)	(264)	(301)	(251)	(1,588)	(1,983)	(1,502)
Q2H - In the past 12 months, have you contacted the Multnomah County library by computer?									
No	74%	81%	68%	70%	82%	82%	76%	79%	78%
Yes	26%	19%	32%	30%	18%	18%	24%	21%	22%
	(249)	(251)	(272)	(264)	(303)	(252)	(1,591)	(1,985)	(1,504)
Q2I - Overall, how satisfied are you with Multnomah County libraries?									
Very dissatisfied	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%
Somewhat satisfied	26%	35%	29%	32%	29%	32%	30%	30%	24%
Very satisfied	71%	62%	69%	64%	67%	64%	66%	67%	73%
	(213)	(182)	(229)	(208)	(237)	(200)	(1,269)	(1,607)	(1,203)

	2003							Prior Year TOTALS	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
COUNTY SERVICES									
Q3 - 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	65%	75%	68%	69%	71%	75%	70%	76%	72%
Yes	35%	25%	32%	31%	29%	25%	30%	24%	28%
	(244)	(247)	(270)	(261)	(298)	(245)	(1,565)	(1,924)	(1,485)
Q3A - What service or services were you looking for?									
Q3B - How difficult or easy was it to find the service?									
Very difficult	19%	13%	11%	11%	9%	17%	13%	13%	
Somewhat difficult	16%	17%	16%	14%	15%	20%	16%	14%	
Somewhat easy	26%	28%	28%	31%	29%	23%	28%	18%	
Very easy	39%	42%	45%	44%	47%	40%	43%	55%	
	(84)	(60)	(87)	(80)	(83)	(60)	(454)	(456)	
Q3C - Did you know there is a City/County Telephone Information and Referral number?									
No	75%	79%	77%	73%	73%	79%	76%	76%	72%
Yes	25%	21%	23%	27%	27%	21%	24%	24%	28%
	(249)	(250)	(273)	(263)	(303)	(252)	(1,590)	(1,978)	(1,500)
Q3D - Have you used the City/County Information and Referral number in the past year?									
No	68%	81%	69%	79%	61%	78%	72%	63%	68%
Yes	32%	19%	31%	21%	39%	22%	28%	37%	32%
	(62)	(52)	(62)	(71)	(83)	(54)	(384)	(471)	(415)

	2003							Prior Year TOTALS	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q3E - How satisfied were you with the information received?									
Very dissatisfied	25%	10%	-	20%	22%	-	15%	7%	8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	5%	-	11%	20%	6%	17%	9%	9%	5%
Somewhat satisfied	25%	40%	39%	7%	19%	33%	25%	29%	30%
Very satisfied	45%	50%	50%	53%	53%	50%	51%	55%	57%
	(20)	(10)	(18)	(15)	(32)	(12)	(107)	(170)	(131)
Q4 - Do you have access to the Internet either from home or from another location?									
No	12%	34%	19%	24%	29%	22%	24%	26%	25%
Yes	88%	66%	81%	76%	71%	78%	76%	74%	75%
	(249)	(251)	(274)	(264)	(303)	(252)	(1,593)	(1,988)	(1,504)
Q4A - Did You know Multnomah County has a web page?									
No	43%	48%	43%	41%	49%	48%	45%	47%	50%
Yes	57%	52%	57%	59%	51%	52%	55%	53%	50%
	(218)	(166)	(221)	(200)	(214)	(196)	(1,215)	(1,470)	(1,131)
Q4B - Have you ever used the Multnomah County web page?									
No	64%	56%	61%	55%	65%	65%	61%	57%	61%
Yes	36%	44%	39%	45%	35%	35%	39%	43%	39%
	(122)	(86)	(125)	(119)	(108)	(101)	(661)	(777)	(560)
Q4C - How satisfied were you with the web page?									
Very dissatisfied	5%	3%	-	-	3%	-	2%	1%	3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	7%	5%	6%	8%	12%	12%	8%	7%	7%
Somewhat satisfied	55%	60%	62%	62%	54%	36%	56%	48%	48%
Very satisfied	33%	32%	32%	30%	31%	52%	34%	44%	42%
	(42)	(37)	(47)	(53)	(35)	(33)	(247)	(305)	(201)
Q5A - Are you or a family member currently using senior or aging services?									
No							92%	93%	
Yes							8%	7%	
							(1,589)	(1,984)	

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q5B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							8%	6%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							9%	3%	
Somewhat satisfied							33%	28%	
Very satisfied							50%	63%	
							(120)	(139)	
Q6A - Are you or a family member currently using disability services?									
No							92%	92%	
Yes							8%	8%	
							(1,588)	(1,986)	
Q6B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							10%	5%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							15%	11%	
Somewhat satisfied							28%	31%	
Very satisfied							47%	53%	
							(118)	(150)	
Q7A - Are you or a family member currently using adult foster care?									
No							98%	98%	
Yes							2%	2%	
							(1,593)	(1,986)	
Q7B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							8%	11%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							13%	7%	
Somewhat satisfied							25%	15%	
Very satisfied							54%	67%	
							(24)	(35)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q8A - Are you or a family member currently using the Neighborhood District Attorney Program?									
No							99%	99%	
Yes							1%	1%	
							(1,590)	(1,975)	
Q8B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							-	9%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							-	4%	
Somewhat satisfied							70%	26%	
Very satisfied							30%	61%	
							(10)	(23)	
Q9A - Are you or a family member currently using the Connections Program for Young Parents?									
No							99%	99%	
Yes							1%	1%	
							(1,593)	(1,979)	
Q9B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied								7%	
Somewhat dissatisfied								-	
Somewhat satisfied								29%	
Very satisfied							100%	64%	
							(2)	(14)	
Q10A - Are you or a family member currently using a County clinic, for example, a TB, Methadone, HIV, or dental clinic?									
No							96%	95%	
Yes							4%	5%	
							(1,590)	1,979)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze

	2003							Prior Year TOTALS	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q10B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							7%	8%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							8%	8%	
Somewhat satisfied							25%	32%	
Very satisfied							60%	52%	
							(60)	(104)	
Q11A - Are you or a family member currently using the Healthy Start Program?									
No							99%	99%	
Yes							1%	1%	
							(1,595)	(1,971)	
Q11B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							-	11%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							-	-	
Somewhat satisfied							33%	39%	
Very satisfied							67%	50%	
							(3)	(18)	
Q12A - Are you or a family member currently using mediation for family court services?									
No							99%	98%	
Yes							1%	2%	
							(1,590)	(1,986)	
Q12B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							35%	23%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							6%	11%	
Somewhat satisfied							41%	33%	
Very satisfied							18%	33%	
							(17)	(27)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q13A - Are you or a family member currently using the WIC program?									
No							95%	94%	
Yes							5%	6%	
							(1,593)	(1,983)	
Q13B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							1%	6%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							4%	2%	
Somewhat satisfied							26%	25%	
Very satisfied							69%	67%	
							(78)	(115)	
Q14A - Are you or a family member currently using the Foodhandler's Card program?									
No							91%	90%	
Yes							9%	10%	
							(1,593)	(1,980)	
Q14B - Overall, how satisfied are you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							1%	4%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							4%	2%	
Somewhat satisfied							33%	27%	
Very satisfied							62%	67%	
							(141)	(172)	
Q15A - In the past year, have you been a victim of a crime?									
No	86%	83%	74%	76%	81%	76%	79%	80%	
Yes	14%	17%	26%	24%	19%	24%	21%	20%	
	(250)	(251)	(274)	(264)	(302)	(251)	(1,592)	(1,989)	
Q15B - Did you report the crime?									
No	20%	42%	28%	27%	17%	25%	26%	28%	
Yes	80%	58%	72%	73%	83%	75%	74%	72%	
	(35)	(43)	(72)	(64)	(58)	(61)	(333)	(405)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q15C - Did you have contact with the District Attorney's Office?									
No							91%	88%	
Yes							9%	12%	
							(331)	(403)	
Q15D - Did they inform you of services that may help you?									
No							28%	36%	
Yes							72%	64%	
							(29)	(47)	
Q15E - Did you receive help from a DA-appointed victim's advocate?									
No							85%	52%	
Yes							15%	48%	
							(20)	(29)	
Q15F - Overall, how satisfied were you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							-	7%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							-	7%	
Somewhat satisfied							67%	22%	
Very satisfied							33%	64%	
							(3)	(14)	
Q16A - In the past year, have you been supervised by a County parole or probation officer?									
No							99%	99%	
Yes							1%	1%	
							(1,594)	(1,989)	
Q16B - In the past year, did you have regular contact with your parole or probation officer?									
No							33%	38%	
Yes							67%	62%	
							(12)	(21)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q16C - In the past year, do you feel you have received fair treatment by your parole or probation officer?									
No							25%	38%	
Yes							75%	62%	
							(12)	(21)	
Q16D - In the past year, how often has your parole or probation officer treated you with respect?									
Always							42%	70%	
Most of the time							25%	20%	
Some of the time							17%	-	
Never							16%	10%	
							(12)	(20)	
Q17A - In the past year, have you been incarcerated in a Multnomah County jail?									
No							99%	99%	
Yes							1%	1%	
							(1,594)	(1,989)	
Q17B - Do you feel you received fair treatment from jail personnel?									
No							40%	21%	
Yes							60%	79%	
							(10)	(14)	
Q17C - How often do you feel jail personnel treated you with respect?									
Always							-	23%	
Most of the time							40%	39%	
Some of the time							50%	23%	
Never							10%	15%	
							(10)	(13)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q17D - Did you receive any transitional services to assist you with reentry into the community?									
No							80%	75%	
Yes							20%	25%	
							(10)	(12)	
Q17E - What service or services did you receive?									
Q17F - Overall, how satisfied were you with this service?									
Very dissatisfied							-	33%	
Somewhat dissatisfied							-	33%	
Somewhat satisfied							50%	-	
Very satisfied							50%	34%	
							(2)	(3)	
Q18A - In the past year, have you applied for a marriage license or domestic partner registration?									
No							98%	97%	
Yes							2%	3%	
							(1,594)	(1,987)	
Q18B - How difficult or easy was it to find the applications?									
Very difficult							-	2%	
Somewhat difficult							7%	6%	
Somewhat easy							29%	14%	
Very easy							64%	78%	
							(28)	(49)	

Numbers Too Small
to Analyze



	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
	Numbers Too Small to Analyze								
Q18C - How difficult or easy was it to understand the application process?									
Very difficult							-	3%	
Somewhat difficult							10%	8%	
Somewhat easy							29%	14%	
Very easy							61%	75%	
							(28)	(51)	
Q19A - Do you use any of these bridges at least once a week: Sellwood, Hawthorne, Morrison, Burnside, Broadway, and/or Sauvie Island?									
No	41%	47%	39%	33%	67%	72%	50%	44%	
Yes	59%	53%	61%	67%	33%	28%	50%	56%	
	(249)	(250)	(274)	(264)	(303)	(251)	(1,591)	(1,982)	
Q19B - In the past year, have you experienced a bridge closure or delay due to a special event or construction?									
No	40%	29%	34%	40%	47%	50%	39%	38%	
Yes	60%	71%	66%	60%	53%	50%	61%	62%	
	(147)	(132)	(164)	(176)	(97)	(70)	(786)	(1,093)	
Q19C - Do you feel you were adequately notified in advance of the changes in traffic flow due to the event or construction?									
No	24%	23%	28%	25%	29%	9%	24%	23%	
Yes	76%	77%	72%	75%	71%	91%	76%	77%	
	(88)	(92)	(107)	(102)	(51)	(34)	(474)	(671)	

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
NEIGHBORHOOD									
Q20A – I think my neighborhood is a good place for me to live.									
Strongly disagree	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	3%	3%
Somewhat disagree	3%	6%	5%	5%	11%	7%	6%	5%	5%
Somewhat agree	19%	36%	30%	27%	39%	29%	30%	30%	28%
Strongly agree	77%	55%	64%	67%	47%	63%	62%	62%	64%
	(249)	(250)	(272)	(262)	(295)	(251)	(1,579)	(1,966)	(1,492)
Q20B - I feel there is a sense of community in my neighborhood.									
Strongly disagree	4%	7%	4%	5%	12%	9%	7%	7%	8%
Somewhat disagree	13%	15%	14%	13%	23%	19%	16%	13%	13%
Somewhat agree	42%	44%	39%	40%	41%	35%	40%	43%	42%
Strongly agree	41%	34%	43%	42%	24%	37%	37%	37%	37%
	(247)	(247)	(265)	(260)	(294)	(243)	(1,556)	(1,925)	(1,458)
Q20C - If children in my community were doing something wrong, neighbors would do something about it.									
Strongly disagree	2%	8%	6%	4%	10%	6%	6%	6%	7%
Somewhat disagree	11%	18%	13%	10%	10%	14%	13%	10%	13%
Somewhat agree	44%	41%	39%	47%	43%	41%	42%	43%	40%
Strongly agree	43%	33%	42%	39%	37%	39%	39%	41%	40%
	(234)	(234)	(248)	(240)	(259)	(234)	(1,449)	(1,817)	(1,339)
Q20D - Adults in my community know the kids in their neighborhood.									
Strongly disagree	10%	9%	7%	9%	10%	10%	9%	9%	12%
Somewhat disagree	16%	23%	19%	19%	19%	17%	19%	15%	19%
Somewhat agree	41%	44%	41%	44%	43%	43%	43%	44%	40%
Strongly agree	33%	24%	33%	28%	28%	30%	29%	32%	29%
	(225)	(223)	(245)	(236)	(251)	(230)	(1,410)	(1,772)	(1,330)

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q20E - Very few of my neighbors know me.									
Strongly disagree	29%	28%	33%	31%	24%	25%	28%	30%	29%
Somewhat disagree	25%	27%	21%	24%	22%	23%	24%	22%	21%
Somewhat agree	30%	31%	26%	29%	28%	29%	29%	29%	28%
Strongly agree	16%	14%	20%	16%	26%	23%	19%	19%	22%
	(247)	(249)	(270)	(262)	(296)	(248)	(1,572)	(1,972)	(1,496)
Q20F - People around here are willing to help their neighbors.									
Strongly disagree	2%	5%	2%	2%	6%	4%	4%	5%	5%
Somewhat disagree	6%	9%	6%	7%	8%	6%	7%	6%	8%
Somewhat agree	43%	50%	42%	43%	45%	44%	44%	43%	41%
Strongly agree	49%	36%	50%	48%	41%	46%	45%	46%	46%
	(244)	(239)	(262)	(257)	(277)	(239)	(1,518)	(1,910)	(1,451)
Q20G - I can recognize most of the people who live on my block.									
Strongly disagree	6%	6%	6%	5%	11%	8%	7%	7%	8%
Somewhat disagree	16%	8%	10%	14%	13%	10%	12%	10%	10%
Somewhat agree	33%	34%	25%	31%	28%	34%	31%	35%	28%
Strongly agree	45%	52%	59%	50%	48%	48%	50%	48%	54%
	(247)	(251)	(272)	(264)	(299)	(249)	(1,582)	(1,971)	(1,491)
Q20H - You can count on adults in this neighborhood to watch out that children are safe.									
Strongly disagree	1%	7%	3%	2%	7%	4%	4%	5%	6%
Somewhat disagree	8%	13%	9%	9%	15%	9%	11%	8%	9%
Somewhat agree	39%	43%	38%	42%	35%	43%	40%	41%	37%
Strongly agree	52%	37%	50%	47%	43%	44%	45%	46%	48%
	(229)	(226)	(239)	(234)	(263)	(232)	(1,423)	(1,836)	(1,371)
Q20I - People move in and out of my neighborhood a lot.									
Strongly disagree	37%	34%	34%	30%	33%	37%	35%	38%	38%
Somewhat disagree	29%	29%	35%	35%	28%	26%	30%	28%	26%
Somewhat agree	21%	30%	20%	21%	20%	20%	22%	21%	20%
Strongly agree	13%	7%	11%	14%	19%	17%	13%	13%	16%
	(246)	(250)	(265)	(255)	(292)	(245)	(1,553)	(1,913)	(1,452)

	2003							Prior Year TOTALS	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
	Q20J - I regularly stop and talk with the people in my neighborhood.								
Strongly disagree	8%	9%	9%	11%	17%	11%	11%	11%	13%
Somewhat disagree	14%	22%	14%	15%	19%	16%	17%	13%	13%
Somewhat agree	43%	35%	37%	39%	37%	38%	38%	42%	39%
Strongly agree	35%	34%	40%	35%	27%	35%	34%	34%	35%
	(249)	(249)	(271)	(264)	(296)	(250)	(1,579)	(1,966)	(1,494)
Q21A - In your neighborhood how much of a problem is kids who are not in school during the day?									
No problem at all	89%	79%	76%	82%	77%	81%	80%	80%	82%
Somewhat of a problem	8%	19%	19%	15%	20%	16%	17%	16%	15%
A big problem	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%
	(235)	(236)	(247)	(239)	(270)	(226)	(1,453)	(1,810)	(1,293)
Q21B - How much of a problem is alcohol or drug abuse in your neighborhood?									
No problem at all	79%	57%	56%	61%	66%	75%	66%	66%	63%
Somewhat of a problem	17%	31%	32%	30%	25%	19%	25%	25%	28%
A big problem	4%	12%	12%	9%	9%	6%	9%	9%	9%
	(238)	(237)	(255)	(246)	(271)	(219)	(1,466)	(1,809)	(1,289)
Q21C - How much of a problem is neighbors' fighting in your neighborhood?									
No problem at all	88%	81%	78%	87%	84%	85%	84%	83%	83%
Somewhat of a problem	10%	17%	19%	11%	12%	12%	14%	14%	14%
A big problem	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%
	(247)	(250)	(269)	(260)	(292)	(241)	(1,559)	(1,932)	(1,454)
Q21D - How often is this fighting within a family?									
Never	37%	18%	15%	16%	23%	10%	19%	19%	13%
Sometimes	46%	50%	44%	47%	62%	59%	51%	50%	56%
Often	17%	32%	41%	37%	15%	31%	30%	31%	31%
	(24)	(44)	(54)	(30)	(39)	(32)	(223)	(298)	(197)

	2003							Prior Year TOTALS	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q21E - How much of a problem is graffiti in your neighborhood?									
No problem at all	87%	82%	67%	69%	84%	78%	78%	78%	73%
Somewhat of a problem	10%	16%	28%	26%	14%	15%	18%	20%	23%
A big problem	3%	2%	5%	5%	2%	7%	4%	2%	4%
	(249)	(248)	(274)	(264)	(299)	(251)	(1,585)	(1,968)	(1,486)
Q21F - How much of a problem in your neighborhood are kids hanging around after school and on weekends?									
No problem at all	92%	85%	82%	87%	78%	81%	84%	83%	82%
Somewhat of a problem	7%	13%	15%	12%	19%	15%	14%	14%	14%
A big problem	1%	2%	3%	1%	3%	4%	2%	3%	4%
	(240)	(246)	(268)	(256)	(289)	(248)	(1,547)	(1,932)	(1,455)
Q22A - Are you aware of any homeless adults in your neighborhood?									
No	80%	73%	68%	53%	87%	92%	76%	77%	75%
Yes	20%	27%	32%	47%	13%	8%	24%	23%	25%
	(250)	(250)	(274)	(264)	(302)	(251)	(1,591)	(1,955)	(1,497)
Q22B - Are you aware of any homeless children in your neighborhood?									
No	97%	97%	97%	97%	98%	99%	97%	98%	96%
Yes	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%	4%
	(249)	(246)	(271)	(263)	(303)	(251)	(1,583)	(1,957)	(1,495)
Q23A - In general, how safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood during the day?									
Very unsafe	1%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Somewhat unsafe	2%	2%	1%	2%	4%	5%	3%	2%	1%
Somewhat safe	9%	19%	19%	16%	26%	16%	17%	16%	15%
Very safe	88%	79%	79%	82%	69%	78%	79%	80%	82%
	(250)	(250)	(272)	(260)	(299)	(249)	(1,580)	(1,972)	(1,499)
Q23B - In general, how safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood at night?									
Very unsafe	2%	10%	8%	6%	13%	14%	9%	9%	8%
Somewhat unsafe	9%	19%	17%	19%	23%	17%	18%	17%	14%
Somewhat safe	38%	41%	43%	36%	38%	34%	38%	39%	39%
Very safe	51%	30%	32%	39%	26%	35%	35%	35%	39%
	(246)	(240)	(267)	(247)	(290)	(244)	(1,534)	(1,893)	(1,431)

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
OTHER									
Q24 - In what year were you born?									
Q25 - Gender?									
Male	40%	42%	39%	42%	41%	39%	41%	40%	40%
Female	60%	58%	61%	58%	59%	61%	59%	60%	60%
	(250)	(251)	(274)	(264)	(303)	(252)	(1,594)	(1,989)	(1,508)
Q26 - How would you describe your current marital status?									
Single	13%	21%	18%	20%	15%	14%	17%	23%	23%
Married	61%	50%	50%	47%	54%	58%	53%	48%	51%
Living with a partner	8%	7%	9%	11%	2%	6%	7%	7%	4%
Separated	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Divorced	10%	12%	14%	14%	14%	10%	12%	12%	12%
Widowed	7%	8%	8%	7%	12%	10%	9%	8%	8%
	(249)	(251)	(274)	(263)	(300)	(249)	(1,586)	(1,964)	(1,492)
Q27 - Would you describe yourself as any of the following: Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin?									
No	98%	93%	92%	97%	94%	91%	94%	95%	97%
Yes	2%	7%	8%	3%	6%	9%	6%	5%	3%
	(249)	(249)	(272)	(263)	(302)	(251)	(1,586)	(1,973)	(1,502)
Q28A - How would you describe your race?									
White	94%	84%	79%	90%	87%	89%	87%	84%	87%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1%	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Black or African-American	-	3%	11%	1%	1%	1%	3%	4%	4%
Multi-racial	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	2%
Other	1%	6%	3%	3%	6%	6%	4%	6%	3%
	(243)	(248)	(272)	(261)	(302)	(251)	(1,577)	(1,951)	(1,482)
Q28B - If other, how would you describe your race?									

		2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
		West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid-County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q29 -	What is the highest grade or level of school you have completed?									
	Less than 8 years	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%
	Some high school, without a diploma	1%	8%	4%	4%	7%	8%	5%	6%	6%
	High school diploma or GED	10%	27%	18%	16%	24%	27%	21%	19%	19%
	Associate degree	8%	9%	7%	8%	9%	10%	8%	8%	6%
	Some college, but no degree	21%	26%	26%	19%	34%	28%	26%	31%	30%
	Bachelor's degree	31%	17%	21%	24%	14%	15%	21%	17%	20%
	Some graduate study, but no degree	4%	2%	4%	6%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%
	Graduate or professional degree	24%	8%	18%	22%	8%	6%	14%	13%	15%
		(249)	(251)	(274)	(264)	(301)	(251)	(1,590)	(1,972)	(1,495)
Q30 -	About how many hours a week on average, if any, do you work?									
Q31 -	In general, would you say your health is:									
	Excellent	38%	24%	25%	30%	20%	22%	26%	31%	29%
	Very good	39%	33%	40%	35%	37%	39%	37%	33%	36%
	Good	12%	24%	20%	21%	25%	22%	21%	22%	23%
	Fair	7%	13%	9%	10%	12%	13%	11%	11%	9%
	Poor	4%	6%	6%	4%	6%	4%	5%	3%	3%
		(248)	(251)	(272)	(263)	(301)	(251)	(1,586)	(1,976)	(1,499)
Q32 -	On a typical day, to what extent does your physical health or functioning limit your activities?									
	Not at all	73%	57%	71%	66%	61%	62%	65%	69%	73%
	Some	21%	31%	23%	28%	30%	30%	27%	24%	21%
	A great deal	6%	12%	6%	6%	9%	8%	8%	7%	6%
		(248)	(250)	(270)	(264)	(302)	(252)	(1,586)	(1,962)	(1,490)

	2003						Prior Year TOTALS		
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q33 - On a typical day, to what extent do emotional or mental health problems limit your activities?									
Not at all	90%	84%	81%	85%	84%	84%	84%	84%	85%
Some	10%	13%	18%	14%	14%	15%	15%	14%	13%
A great deal	-	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
	(248)	(249)	(269)	(264)	(301)	(252)	(1,583)	(1,958)	(1,492)
Q34 - How many children and adults, including yourself, are living in your household right now?									
Q35 - Of the people in your household, how many are children aged 18 or younger?									
Q36 - Do you live in:									
Single family home	77%	84%	74%	75%	76%	67%	75%	77%	77%
A 2, 3-, or 4-plex	3%	5%	6%	10%	7%	8%	7%	7%	6%
A larger apartment or condominium complex	17%	9%	18%	13%	14%	21%	15%	13%	15%
Other	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%
	(249)	(251)	(274)	(263)	(301)	(251)	(1,589)	(1,978)	(1,500)
Q37 - Do you rent or own?									
Rent	22%	24%	34%	33%	26%	34%	29%	31%	30%
Own	78%	76%	66%	67%	74%	66%	71%	69%	70%
	(246)	(250)	(272)	(263)	(301)	(251)	(1,583)	(1,967)	(1,495)

	2003							Prior Year TOTAL	
	West	North	Northeast	Southeast	Mid- County	East	County Total	2002	2001
Q38 - What language do you usually speak at home?									
English	95%	91%	94%	94%	92%	87%	92%	94%	96%
Spanish	1%	5%	4%	3%	4%	8%	4%	3%	1%
Other	4%	4%	2%	3%	4%	5%	4%	3%	3%
	(248)	(250)	(274)	(264)	(301)	(252)	(1,589)	(1,984)	(1,499)
Q39 - If other, what language do you speak at home?									
Q40 - Which of the following statements best describes your ability to get along on your household income?									
You can't make ends meet	4%	8%	6%	7%	9%	7%	7%	6%	7%
You have just enough, no more	17%	27%	24%	20%	25%	23%	23%	23%	21%
You have enough, with a little extra sometimes	45%	48%	44%	45%	46%	49%	46%	48%	44%
You always have money left over	34%	17%	26%	28%	20%	21%	24%	23%	28%
	(243)	(248)	(270)	(259)	(297)	(248)	(1,565)	(1,920)	(1,456)
Q41 - 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 (in constant dollars)	\$86,058	\$47,185	\$61,302	\$52,197	\$47,571	\$59,079	\$58,595	\$55,156	\$51,128