

Perceptions Regarding Public Safety in Portland's Humboldt Neighborhood

Research Brief

Kris Henning, Portland State University

Greg Stewart, Portland Police Bureau



Humboldt Neighborhood, Portland Oregon

Key Findings

- *Despite several improvements in recent years, the area surrounding N. Albina Ave. and N. Killingsworth St. generated the most public safety concerns.*
- *Guns, gang activity, and alcohol/drugs were the top concerns listed by respondents. Traffic safety was also identified as a significant concern.*
- *Most respondents feel safe walking alone in the neighborhood during the day, but one-quarter of those completing the survey believe that public safety has declined over the past year.*
- *The majority of respondents desire an improved relationship with the Portland Police. People felt this could be achieved through non-investigatory foot patrols, community meetings, and expanded police participation in community events.*

Introduction


The Portland Police Bureau ([PPB](#)) is partnering with Portland State University ([PSU](#)) and neighborhood groups to develop new strategies for improving public safety and police-community relations. The current initiative seeks to provide residents in Portland's neighborhoods with greater voice in where police work in their neighborhood and what steps the City takes there to address public safety concerns. We also hope to provide residents, businesses, and community organizations with information they can use to leverage additional resources to address safety concerns in their area.

This report focuses on the Humboldt neighborhood. Humboldt is located in the Northeast section of Portland (i.e. North of Burnside Ave. and East of the Willamette River). Major landmarks include [Portland Community College](#) and [Jefferson High School](#). PSU's [Population Research Center](#) estimates that there were 5,110 residents living in the neighborhood in 2010, a 1.0% increase from 2000. Households in the neighborhood increased 15.9% over this period from 1,921 to 2,227. For additional information on the neighborhood, contact the [Humboldt Neighborhood Association](#).

In March 2016 all known households in the Humboldt neighborhood were mailed a letter inviting the adult occupants to participate in an online survey. Among other things, the survey asked residents to identify their primary public safety concerns, whether they supported or opposed various actions the city might take in responding to these problems, and for ideas about improving police-community relationships. Two hundred and twenty-two completed surveys were submitted and analyzed for this report.



Neighborhood Map & Areas of Concern



The approximate boundaries of the Humboldt neighborhood were mapped for the online survey and divided into 20 distinct 1,000' x 1,000' areas. These regions are numbered in blue text on the map above, from 1 (upper left corner) to 20 (bottom right). Residents were asked to 'click' with their computer mouse all of the areas where they had public safety concerns. For the purpose of the survey, **public safety** was defined as "crime, traffic safety, environmental hazards, etc."

The percentages on the map (orange text) give the percent of survey respondents ‘clicking’ each region. For example, 17% of the respondents reported they had safety concerns in area #1 on the map (upper leftmost square).

Overall, there was a moderate degree of consensus among citizens regarding the presence of public safety concerns in the area around PCC (area #6), the regions East (#7) and west (#5) of PCC, and the area around Jefferson High School (#10).

Public Safety Concerns & Problems Reported

Area on Map	% Said Area has Safety Concerns	% Selected Area as "Top 3" Concern	Five Most Common Problems Reported (# Respondents)
1	17%	6%	Guns (10), Property crimes (6), Violent crime (4), Gangs (4), Traffic offenses (4)
2	26%	14%	Guns (20), Gangs (18), Violent crime (10), Drugs/alcohol (9), Property crimes (6)
3	15%	5%	Property crimes (7), Traffic offenses (7), Guns (4), Violent crime (2), Social disorder (2)
4	11%	3%	Violent crime (4), Guns (4), Property crimes (3), Drugs/alcohol (3), Gangs (2)
5	38%	18%	Guns (20), Drugs/alcohol (14), Gangs (14), Unsupervised youth (11), Property crimes (10)
6	49%	33%	Guns (45), Gangs (37), Drugs/alcohol (24), Violent crime (19), Unsupervised youth (19)
7	42%	21%	Guns (23), Property crimes (18), Drugs/alcohol (15), Violent crime (14), Gangs (13)
8	27%	7%	Property crimes (8), Guns (6), Social disorder (5), Traffic offenses (5), Property maintenance (4)
9	24%	9%	Guns (8), Property maintenance (7), Traffic offenses (7), Property crimes (6), Drugs/alcohol (6)
10	38%	23%	Guns (31), Gangs (22), Property crimes (15), Unsupervised youth (15), Drugs/alcohol (14)
11	31%	12%	Guns (18), Gangs (13), Violent crime (12), Property crimes (10), Drugs/alcohol (9)
12	19%	8%	Guns (9), Drugs/alcohol (6), Property crimes (5), Violent crime (5), Social disorder (5)
13	13%	5%	Property crimes (5), Social disorder (4), Property maintenance (3), Traffic offenses (3), Guns (2)
14	21%	12%	Guns (18), Gangs (15), Drugs/alcohol (8), Property maintenance (8), Violent crime (8)
15	29%	19%	Guns (33), Gangs (20), Violent crime (17), Property crimes (13), Drugs/alcohol (12)
16	17%	7%	Drugs/alcohol (9), Gangs (6), Guns (5), Violent crime (3), Property maintenance (3)
17	12%	4%	Property crimes (5), Drugs/alcohol (5), Violent crime (2), Social disorder (2), Guns (2)
18	13%	5%	Drugs/alcohol (6), Property crimes (4), Guns (4), Traffic offenses (4), Gangs (3)
19	18%	8%	Traffic offenses (7), Property crimes (6), Guns (6), Property maintenance (5), Social disorder (4)
20	15%	6%	Traffic offenses (6), Drugs/alcohol (4), Other (4), Guns (2), Environmental hazards (2)
All Areas Combined		Guns (270), Gangs (187), Drugs/alcohol (154), Property crimes (149), Violent crime (127)	

In addition to reporting all areas of public safety concern (the ‘clicking’ referred to previously), respondents were asked to identify up to three regions on the map that were of **greatest concern** (see third column in table above). For each of these areas, residents could then select three specific public safety problems from the following list: Property crime, violent crime, guns, drugs/alcohol, social disorder, property maintenance, gangs, unsupervised youth, traffic offenses, environmental hazards, and “other”.

Region #6 on the map was identified as an **area of concern** by 49% of residents surveyed and it was also listed as a **greatest concern** by one-third (33%) of the respondents. The specific concerns residents listed for this area of the neighborhood included: guns (45 residents identified this as a concern), gangs (37), drugs/alcohol (24), and violent crime (19).

Region #7 on the map, directly east of region #6, was selected as an **area of concern** by 42% of residents completing the survey and was selected as a **greatest concern** by 21% of the respondents. The specific concerns listed for this region included: guns (233), property crimes (18), drugs/alcohol (15), violent crime (14) and gangs (13).

Looking at the neighborhood as a whole, residents selected guns as the #1 public safety concern for Humboldt (mentioned 270 times) followed by gangs (187), and drugs/alcohol (154).

Respondents were asked to provide additional information about their primary public safety concern for the Humboldt neighborhood. These text responses were analyzed to identify recurring themes.

Similar to our findings on the prior page, **shootings and gun crimes** were the most frequently reported concern among residents (mentioned 49 times). For example:

- *"We are most concerned with the increase in shootings. I've been here 10 years and this past year seems extremely bad. We have had several shootings on Blandena in the last couple months."*
- *"There have been several shootings in the past few years, including a murder right outside our house. It occurred in midafternoon, minutes before school let out. Since then, there have been two other significant gun shootings within one block of our house."*
- *"There have been multiple shootings and one homicide just since the beginning of the year. Gang violence has become expected in this neighborhood."*
- *"There have been multiple incidents recently in which a house on the corner of N Blandena and N Haight have been shot with a gun."*
- *"Our neighbors (Area 15) had their house shot up twice in a few weeks. I don't enjoy having to dive to the ground when I hear gunfire."*


The second most common problem observed in the text responses, **traffic safety** (45), was rarely selected in the discrete choice options covered on the prior page. The most common traffic problems reported were speeding and aggressive behavior. For example:

- *"Aggressive driving between Albina and Alberta and Albina and Michigan in the lane heading west, all the time, but mostly at night. Cars parked on the side of the road get hit (my car has been hit four times in two or three years and my neighbor's car twice), people speed and I have almost been hit multiple times crossing the street at the stoplight when the walk sign is on or crosswalk."*
- *"Areas 19 & 16 are extremely tenuous and unsafe. Heavy traffic, aggressive driving, bikers and pedestrians behaving as if the 'share the road' laws do not apply to them."*
- *"I've noticed traffic is increasing more and more, overwhelming our day to day living (all along the day with peaks for lunch time and between 4:00 and 6:00 pm) accompanied by speeding, aggressive driving and noise!"*
- *"I often observe aggressive driving (excessive speeding) on the I-5 N exit 303 off-ramp, and frontage roads (running parallel to N Missouri Ave. and forming the four-way intersection with N. Alberta.). It seems that when traffic is particularly heavy on I-5 N (rush hour), a maneuver some motorists resort to is to take the 303 exit, only to re-enter the interstate via the on-ramp after crossing the intersection N Missouri / N Alberta intersection."*
- *"People regularly speed on an extremely narrow road with children on it. The constant presence of portable storage areas isn't helping things."*
- *"Traffic offenses are out of control at all times in this entire area! People are constantly speeding, running stop signs. It is dangerous to walk, drive and bike."*

Several people identified factors that they believe are contributing to these traffic safety issues including narrow streets, parking in both directions, heavy use by commercial vehicles, and use of residential streets to access PCC or avoid freeway congestion on I-5. Suggestions offered to improve traffic safety included expanded use of speed bumps, additional stop signs/lights, reduced speed limits, and other design changes that will safely regulate speed and turning onto adjacent streets.

Perceived Safety in Humboldt Neighborhood


Perceived Safety Over Past Year



The survey asked several questions about perceived safety. Public perceptions about safety may be just as important as actual criminal events in that excess fear can result in residents withdrawing from community life and deterioration of neighborhood businesses. Hence, the PPB's stated mission is to, "*reduce crime and the fear of crime.*"


When asked about *changes in perceived safety* over the past year, most respondents felt that Humboldt had stayed about the same (57%). A minority (17%) felt that the neighborhood had become safer, while one-quarter (26%) thought the neighborhood had become more dangerous. Interestingly, current residents who had lived in the neighborhood ten or more years were more likely to report that safety had improved in the past year as compared to residents living there less than ten years (24% vs. 14%). This may reflect the fact that reported **person crimes** in Humboldt (i.e., assaults & robbery) declined 80% from 1995 to 2014 and **property crimes** like burglary, car prowls, motor vehicle theft and vandalism declined 52% (see [Humboldt Neighborhood](#) at the [Portland Crime Data](#) website).

Perceived Safety Walking Alone: In Daytime



Residents were also asked how safe they feel walking alone in Humboldt during the daytime and at night. The vast majority of respondents (89%) felt "safe" or "very safe" walking alone in the neighborhood during the daytime. However, not everyone felt safe at this time of day: 2% of respondents felt unsafe and 9% felt "neither safe nor unsafe". These numbers can be compared to city-wide figures from the [Portland City Auditor's 2015 Community Survey](#) which used a similar question. They found that 91% of Portland residents would feel "safe" to "very safe" walking alone in their neighborhood during the day. Like Humboldt, only 2% of the city's residents reported that they would feel unsafe.


Perceived Safety Walking Alone: At Night




Perceived safety while walking alone was considerably lower for nighttime hours. Only 49% of the respondents felt "safe" to "very safe" walking alone at night in Humboldt. The percentage of people feeling "unsafe" to "very unsafe" walking alone at night (25%) was comparable to the percent of people who answered "neither safe nor unsafe" (27%). In the Auditor's citywide survey 61% of residents answered "safe" or "very safe," 18% said "unsafe" or "very unsafe," and 21% answered "neutral."

Taken together, these findings suggest that most people feel safe in Humboldt during the daytime, but that perceived safety, at least when walking alone, declines considerably at night. A similar pattern is seen for the city as a whole but nighttime concerns appear to be more pronounced in Humboldt.

Residents' Perceptions About Portland Police




Communication Between Residents & Portland Police



Several questions in the survey explored residents' opinions about the Portland Police Bureau (PPB). These questions helped us evaluate the current relationship between the police and Humboldt residents, as well as track changes in the relationship over time.

One of our first findings is that many residents appear to be unaware of PPB's activities in the neighborhood. Participants were given the opportunity to "opt out" of the questions if they did not know enough to answer and this occurred much more frequently than expected. For example, 43% of the respondents answered "don't know" or "not applicable" when asked whether, "The police in Portland are addressing problems that concern residents in Humboldt." Similarly, 50% of respondents answered "don't know" when asked if communication between the police and residents was improving or getting worse.

Trust Between Residents & Portland Police



Our second, and more concerning finding, is that many of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the PPB. This included a lack of confidence in the police, the perception that the police are not addressing the concerns of the neighborhood, and poor evaluation of PPB's efforts to build trust with residents. For the latter, just 8% of the people surveyed said that trust between residents and police had improved in the past year. Similarly, just 9% of the residents perceived that communication between the police and residents had improved.

Participants were also asked to provide a short answer to the following question: *“What steps could be taken to improve relationships between the Portland Police Bureau and residents in the Humboldt neighborhood?”* Several residents commented that the question was difficult to answer because they did not feel they, or the neighborhood, had a relationship with the PPB:

- *“I don't have any interaction with the police in the neighborhood, so I can't comment on the relationship.”*
- *“I don't really see police around my neighborhood.”*
- *“I have answered ‘don't know’ continuously because I don't feel like I have any relationship with the PPB.”*
- *“I haven't had any sort of communication or interaction with PPB”*

Other residents commented that the only time they interacted with officers was during criminal investigations or emergency incidents. Usually the respondents voiced interest in having contact with police outside of these events:

- *“More contact with police outside of times when crimes have been committed.”*
- *“More human interactions with police and residents - interaction outside of calls / issues.”*
- *“Need more police in the area to just have a presence, not just when things go wrong.”*
- *“Typically the police are called when there's a problem. If there aren't many problems or they're small enough to not bother the police, you probably don't have much interaction.”*


Given these comments, it is perhaps not surprising that the most frequently cited approach to improving relations between residents and the police was for the latter to increase their overall visibility and connection to the neighborhood.

- *“Be here more.”*
- *“Be more visible and open to dialogue.”*
- *“BE more visible. When police only come when something bad has happened they appear more threatening than if they already are a known face in the neighborhood.”*

Recommended strategies for achieving greater connectivity ranged from foot patrols, participation in community events, hosting meetings, consistent assignment of officers, and hiring people who live in or are from the neighborhood. For example:

- *“Foot patrols and a routine presence, not just in problem spots and on trendy streets. I would be shocked if a police officer said hello to me near my home.”*
- *“Friendly presence, walking and interacting with the neighborhood”*
- *“Get them out of their offices and/or cars and become a part of their respective communities.”*
- *“I wouldn't mind seeing more officers walking around the business districts or neighborhood, if it could be done in a community oriented, peaceful way.”*
- *“Police that are from the neighborhood, and have an invested interest in protecting and serving it.”*
- *“Community forums, meetings with ‘diverse’ groups to understand exactly what they are doing in terms of public safety.”*
- *“More events that involve Portland Police or having Portland Police at summer events, maybe with a booth or something - like the concerts in the park, summer movie nights, etc.”*
- *“Dedicated officers for the neighborhood that are open and available. Maybe ‘office hours’ at a local coffee shop or park.”*

Policing Strategies to Address Public Safety




Respondents were asked whether they supported or opposed seven distinct police activities that might be used to address public safety in the neighborhood. Use of strategies that are supported by a large proportion of residents may increase the perceived legitimacy of crime prevention efforts.

The policing practice that residents endorsed in greatest numbers was foot patrols, at 85%. Other measures that were endorsed by at least three quarters of the residents surveyed included arranging community meetings (81%) and enforcing trespassing laws (79%). The two strategies that received the most opposition were enforcing curfew laws (23%) and increasing police vehicle patrols.

Participants were also asked: “What is the most important thing the City or Police could do to improve public safety in Humboldt?” The theme most commonly observed in these text responses was to increase police presence in the neighborhood (mentioned 43 times), particularly when it involved building or improving relationships with community members. For example:

- “An increased presence in the neighborhood focusing on ongoing relationship building with the community would likely solve a lot of the local safety issues.”
- “Be present, and be an ally. With knowledge that the North precinct is not abundant with bodies, I still stand by emphasizing the importance of having a relationship with the community, and more specifically, with leaders of our black community. It is my belief that these relationships are most effective when you can make an impression on a young person. At the end of the day, most of us just want to know that there is a mindful person behind the intimidating bullet-proof vest that we see.”
- “I believe a stronger police presence would be beneficial. By stronger, I mean being in sight more often, but also in a positive manner. NOT racial profiling or targeting, but getting out and getting to know the community.”
- “I think right now the most important thing Portland can do is increase foot patrols. There is nothing better than having a relationship with your neighborhood police.”

Other Strategies to Address Public Safety Problems



Strategies for improving public safety that were not necessarily law-enforcement related were also covered in the survey. Respondents were extremely supportive of any efforts that focus on youths (e.g., internships, mentoring, summer programs, after school activities). For example:

- *“I’m most in favor of job training programs, employment opportunities, community college access, mentoring, internships, and any programs possible to provide HOPE and OPPORTUNITY for young people.”*
- *“It appears the youth in the area need more support and direction towards a more productive and healthy lifestyle.”*
- *“Early intervention for at risk families to improve chances that future residents will grow up to have positive view of themselves and city and community.”*


Other activities endorsed by at least 90% of the respondents included cleaning up physical disorder (e.g., litter, graffiti) and improving lighting on streets and sidewalks.

Collective Efficacy

"Residents in Humboldt...."	Agree	Disagree*
Are willing to help each other	81%	9%
Get along with each other	81%	10%
Share the same values	47%	27%
"Residents in Humboldt would...."	Agree	Disagree*
Work with the police to address crime problems	79%	10%
Intervene if they saw someone vandalizing property	56%	23%
Try to intervene if a fight broke out in front of their house	42%	42%
Contact a child's caregivers if they saw the child skipping school	23%	39%


* Remaining percent answered "don't know" or "not applicable".

Relationships Between Residents Over the Past Year



Excludes 43 people who answered "don't know"

Overall Quality of Life in Past Year



Excludes 13 people who answered "don't know"

Public safety may be enhanced when neighbors look out for one another, intervene early to address problems, and share the same values. This is often referred to as "*collective efficacy*." Several questions in our survey addressed this topic.

Over 80% of the respondents felt that residents in Humboldt get along with each other and are willing to help each other when needed (see table above). Considerably fewer people felt that residents in the neighborhood share the same values. With regard specifically to collective efficacy surrounding public safety, respondents showed a high degree of willingness to work with the police on crime problems and a majority would intervene if they saw someone vandalizing property in the neighborhood. Fewer people reported that they would intervene to break up a fight or address juvenile truancy.

With regard to relationships between residents, we found that most of the survey respondents (84%) felt that relationships between residents in Humboldt were either improving or staying about the same. Likewise, the majority of respondents (78%) thought that the overall quality of life in the neighborhood was stable or improving.

Another aspect of collective efficacy is how people feel about their neighborhood. We asked the survey participants the following question: *“What are some of the strengths of the Humboldt neighborhood, things you like about living here or spending time here?”*

The most popular theme emerging from this question was **good neighbors and a strong sense of community** (mentioned by 62 respondents). For example:

- *“Close-knit neighbors heading the same way with a strong desire to improve their environment.”*
- *“Community Awareness; the area is working hard for improvements for our children.”*
- *“Excellent neighbors, everyone watches out for one another.”*
- *“I love the neighborhood feel. I love the diversity of the people, the strong sense of community and the ‘true’ Portland mentality.”*

The second most popular theme (56 people) concerned easy access to a variety of businesses.

- *“For the most part, Humboldt is a quiet, peaceful neighborhood with friendly and respectful residents. Local shopping and eating establishments are a boon, as are the good number of public transportation options.”*
- *“There are many longtime local businesses that meet many of the needs of the surrounding community.”*
- *“I love Peninsula Park and the diverse range of restaurants, food trucks, and coffee shops on Killingsworth.”*
- *“I like having access to a couple of convenience stores, bars, and restaurants, in addition to the library.”*

The third most common theme (52 people) in the text responses focused on the diversity of residents in the area. This included racial/ethnic diversity, but also diversity with regard to age and socioeconomic status. As two of the quotes below illustrate, however, there is also concern about a decline in diversity with gentrification.

- *“I love living near Jefferson High and PCC Cascade. I love the vibrancy of having a lot of youth in the neighborhood after school.”*
- *“I love my block in particular, where we have a close knit community of neighbors across racial, generational, and cultural lines. We all talk to each other and look out for each other. My biggest concern is that more of my neighbors will be displaced by gentrification and that the neighborhood will become more homogenous.”*
- *“Diversity, though it is becoming more and more unaffordable and driving a diverse group of people out of the neighborhood.”*

Other strengths of the neighborhood that were mentioned include walkability, safe biking, extensive access to public transportation, proximity to downtown, nice mixture of new and older homes, access to PCC, and Peninsula Park was repeatedly singled out as an important neighborhood asset.


Based on these findings we believe there is currently a high degree of collective efficacy in Humboldt. While the area is challenged by recent gentrification, most neighbors (at least those surveyed) trust one another, are willing to help each other out when needed, and most feel that the quality of life is stable or improving. This increases the likelihood that residents can organize on their own, as well as partner with the City and police to take steps that will improve public safety in the neighborhood.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this survey, the following options may help support improved safety and livability in the Humboldt neighborhood:

1. The PPB should continue to work with the [Albina and Killingsworth Safe Neighborhood Commission \(AKSNC\)](#) with the goal of improving public safety in and around “Area 6” on our map. This area, once among the most dangerous in Portland, has seen significant improvement over the last five years, and efforts at improving public safety have received recognition nationally ([including being a 2015 finalist for the Herman Goldstein award for Problem-Oriented Policing](#)). However, many of those surveyed continue to express concerns about this area.
2. The PPB should explore a variety of ways to increase their visibility in the neighborhood and improve community relationships. Options worth considering include: a) use of social media to generate increased contact between Humboldt residents and police officers, b) commit to short [1 to 2 hour] community-oriented walking patrols with a consistent group of officers, and c) commit funding and personnel to regularly attend community meetings in the Humboldt neighborhood.
3. While efforts to increase police visibility and community engagement are clearly needed in Humboldt, there are considerable challenges to achieving these goals at this time through policing efforts alone. The PPB has one of the lowest officer-to-resident ratios in the country, and current staffing levels fall well below the agency’s authorized workforce (e.g., down 68 officers in 2016). The resources and expertise of other city agencies will be needed to be improve public safety in Humboldt. For example, respondents had many concerns about traffic safety that could be addressed through environmental redesign and improved traffic control devices. Similarly, residents completing the survey expressed a high level of support for services targeting youth in the area (e.g., summer programs, internships, after school activities).

Sworn Officers Employed vs. Authorized



4. The neighborhood itself also appears to have considerable capacity (i.e., collective efficacy) for improving public safety. Residents and neighborhood associations could organize to set up neighborhood watch programs, pursue grants from governmental and non-profit organizations, and participate in city government meetings to lobby for additional resources.

Survey Methodology & Sample Characteristics

PPB crime analysts used city databases to identify 2,455 distinct household addresses in the Humboldt neighborhood. They mailed each household a letter in March 2016 from (then) PPB Commander Chris Uehara. The letter explained the purpose of the project (i.e., “*learn more about public safety in the Humboldt neighborhood*”) and requested that all adult occupants complete an anonymous online survey. Additional efforts to encourage responding included targeted requests with key community groups and civic leaders from the neighborhood. Street officers and supervisors in the applicable police district were also asked to hand out 3 x 5 cards with the survey link.

Data for the present report were downloaded from the survey site in early June. A total of 222 completed surveys were available at that time. Unfortunately it is impossible to accurately determine the response rate for the survey because we do not know the true number of people who read the mailed invitation or heard about the survey through other means.

We acknowledge that the sample (222) represents a small proportion of the estimated 4,113 adults living in the neighborhood. We also know that the sample is not representative of all residents. Whites and those 35 to 54 years of age were over-represented as compared to the 2010 Census figures (see table below; Population estimates obtained from PSU’s [Population Research Center](#)).

For more information about the survey methodology please contact Dr. Kris Henning at Portland State University, (khenning@pdx.edu).

Demographics		% Survey Respondants	% 2010 Census*
Gender	Male	46%	49%
	Female	53%	51%
	Other	1%	**
Age	18 to 24	0%	12%
	25 to 34	23%	34%
	35 to 44	47%	23%
	45 to 54	19%	13%
	55 to 64	7%	11%
	65 or older	5%	8%
Race	White	84%	59%
	African-American/Black	4%	25%
	Asian	1%	3%
	Am. Indian/Alaska Native	0%	2%
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Isl.	0%	0%
	Some Other Race	6%	5%
	2 or more races	4%	6%
Ethnicity	Hispanic	7%	12%
	Non-Hispanic	93%	88%

*Gender and age based on adults; Race & ethnicity based on all ages. **Not available.



Acknowledgements

This project was supported by Grant No. 2014-WY-BX-0004 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance for the Smart Policing Initiative (SPI). The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not represent the official position or policies of the United State Department of Justice.

Portland SPI Team

Portland Police Bureau

Greg Stewart

Christian Peterson

Sean Sothern

Portland State University

Kris Henning

Kimberly Kahn

Yves Labissiere

Brian Renauer

Consultant

Renee Mitchell

**For Additional Data
and Maps on Crime in
Portland Visit:**

<http://www.pdx.edu/crime-data>