The Problem Oriented Approach to Drug Enforcement Project

San Diego Police Department

Funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance Administered by the Police Executive Research Forum

March 15,1989

The Problem-Oriented Approach to Drug Enforcement Project

The Police Executive Research Forum has a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Justice Assistance to conduct a two-year project applying the principles of problem-oriented policing to drug problems of five cities. The objectives of the project are three-fold:

- To increase the effectiveness of police in battling drug problems by addressing the underlying problems that give rise to incidents that drive patrol time;
- to increase the reliance on the knowledge and creative approaches of line officers to analyze problems and develop solutions; and,
- to develop a closer involvement with the public to see that police address the needs of citizens.

Five cities are participating in the project -- Atlanta, Tampa, Philadelphia, Tulsa, and San Diego. Each of these project sites has targeted a portion of its city that faces severe problems with a dimension of the comprehensive drug problem; street level dealing of crack cocaine is a major concern in each site. Four of the project cities have also focused predominantly upon areas which include large public housing complexes. Those cities are also implementing project strategies that include an active role for both residents and management of the housing authorities. All of the cities are developing a cooperative interagency response to maximize the benefits of both public and private resources.

Each of the cities in the Problem-Oriented Approach to Drug Enforcement project has a formal task group or management committee that has conducted an inventory of the city's drug problem in a target area. In addition, those task groups are guiding the organizational applications of the problem-oriented policing techniques. The strategies are being used by officers and supervisors who are involved in the project and were trained by the Forum staff. In each city, a Field Technical Assistance Coordinator provides technical assistance to the task group and to the officers who are using the problem-solving techniques.

The Problem-Oriented Approach to Drug Enforcement project is supported by Grant No. 88-DD-CX-KO72 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington DC 20531. BJA program monitors are: Richard H. Ward, Chief, Law Enforcement Branch, and Donald J. Anderson, Program Manager. The project is administered by the Police Executive Research Forum, 2300 M Street, NW, Suite 910, Washington, DC 20037. The Forum's program staff are: Darrel Stephens, John E. Eck, Deborah Lamm Weisel and Diane Hill.

Contributors

This report was produced by:

Patrick Drummy
Crime Analysis
San Diego Police Department

The Problem-Oriented Approach to Drug Enforcement project In San Diego Is managed by a Problem Analysis Advisory Committee (PAAC) consisting of the following members.

Their contributions are greatly appreciated.

Jerry Sanders, Captain, Southeastern Area Command

Bill Becker, Lieutenant, W.E.C.A.N.

Bob Stinson, Lieutenant, Southeastern Area Command

George Saldamando, Lieutenant, Gangs

Jennifer Grier, Analyst, Crime Analysis

Nancy McPherson, POP Coordinator, Police Executive Research Forum

Mark Foreman, Sergeant, Southeastern Area Command

Ed Newberry, Sergeant, W.E.C.A.N.

Dave Williams, Officer, Southeastern Area Command

Guy Swanger, Officer, W.E.C.A.N.

Bill Dawson, Executive Director, CRASH

Paul Desrochers, Community Development Director, City of Chula Vista

Cecilia Estrada, Principal, Sherman Elementary

Barbara Frank, Deputy Chief Probation Officer, Adult Services

Dr. Tom Gltchoff, Professor and CrimInologIst, San Diego State University

Cathy LexIn, Deputy Executive Director, Housing Commission

Bishop George McKInney, Minister, St. Stephen's Church of God In Christ

Daniel Morales, Special Assistant to Councilman Wes Pratt

Pat Phoenix, Manager-Consumer Services, San Diego Gas and Electric

Joe Schilling, Head Code Enforcement Deputy, City Attorney

LCDR Marlin Smith, Security Officer, Naval Station San Diego

Jeff Wynne, Manager of Public Education and Policy Development, County Alcohol Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>P</u>	<u>AGE</u>
Introduction	1 ·
Drugs of Choice	.4
Target Area	.6
Community Survey Description	<u>.</u> 9
Findings	.14
Attachments	.15
Community Survey Instrument	.21
Community Survey Instrument Results	27

INTRODUCTION

San Diego, much like most large cities in the nation, has experienced rapid changes in the drug picture in the 1980's. At different times, PCP, methamphetamine and crack cocaine surfaced and presented law enforcement officials with unique challenges. Surely, new drugs, most likely designed in laboratories, will emerge in the future.

The primary challenge we faced in assembling our drug inventory was gathering data on all indicators of drug activity, both within and outside of the criminal justice system. We felt the first step towards addressing the problem was to have all the facts, and only then, develop the strategies we would utilize.

Does San Diego have an exploding drug problem? Well, felony drug arrests doubled in San Diego between 1980 and 1987 from 3,343 to 6,591 (Attachment A). But the number of specialized narcotics personnel more than tripled during this same period (from 29 to 97). Since more personnel translates to more arrests, we better look elsewhere for signs of a growing problem.

Several studies have shown a strong link between drug use and criminal activity*. Following this logic, one would expect crimes associated with drug use to soar if drug use increased. San Diego crime statistics show some support for the existing perception that there is an expanding drug problem (Attachment B). Of the four crime types most commonly associated with drug abuse, only auto thefts have shown a tremendous increase. Since 1984, burglaries have increased by 14%, homicides have decreased by 7% and robberies have increased by 32%. Auto thefts have increased by 107%, but even this increase is tempered by two factors; the recent proliferation of professional "chop shops", and the fact that most stolen cars are quickly recovered, meaning that the motive for many of these thefts probably was quick transportation, not selling them for drugs.

For data that provides stronger support for a deteriorating drug picture, it was necessary to examine data from other sources, or develop new measures.

One measure of the increase in cocaine traffic is the amount seized in San Diego County in the last three years (Attachment C). In 1985, 134 kilos were seized. In 1986 and 1987, 901 and 607 kilos were seized. Obviously, there is more cocaine in the County than in previous years.

* National Institute of Justice, "DRUG USE FORECASTING (DUF)\ 1987

Manhattan Central Booking Facility, "DRUG TESTING RESEARCH", 1984

Gandossy et al., Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1980

Other indicators lend credence to a recent drug explosion. Deaths in the County attributed to drugs have doubled since 1983 (Attachment D). Drug-related emergency room admissions also have doubled during this period (Attachment E). But the most compelling statistics come from County Oail. As part of a national study in 12 large cities, felons arrested for all crime types in San Diego are being tested for the presence of illegal drugs in their system immediately after booking. In the most recent sample, 80% of the participants tested positive for some drug (Attachment F). The testing is repeated each quarter, and the last three quarters have shown a consistent increase in the percentage of volunteers who test positive. Clearly, the link between drug use and criminal activity in San Diego is being established.

DRUGS OF CHOICE

Which are the major drugs of choice now in San Diego?

METHAMPHETAMINE

San Diego County has become the methamphetamine or "Crystal meth" capital of the country. Some estimates place local seizures at one-fourth to one-third of the U.S. total in 1987. One of the main reasons for this popularity is the fact that , until recently, all of the active ingredients of the drug could be purchased legally, over the counter, from local chemical supply houses.

Between 1985 and 1986, the amount of crystal meth seized locally quadrupled. Methamphetamine admissions to county drug treatment programs increased 312% between 1983 and 1987. In the most recent study done at the County Oail 28% of those arrested for felonies tested positive for meth.

COCAINE

The emergence of cocaine, and more recently crack or rock cocaine, has had a tremendous impact on this Department. Cocaine abuse is widespread because the drug is cheap, plentiful and extremely addictive.

Although Miami was once the hub for cocaine importation into the United States, bulk shipments are more often being flown into Texas and Southern California. This is because demand is increasing in the West and it is more difficult to get a shipment into South Florida, where much of the federal enforcement manpower is concentrated. It is generally smuggled into San Diego from Mexico. In 1984, the Los Angeles Police Department confiscated 758 pounds of cocaine. They estimate that they will seize a staggering 15,000 pounds this year.

Crack or smokabie cocaine, is the drug of choice in Southeast San Diego where our target area is located.

The most recent study in County Jail showed 44% of felon inmates testing positive for cocaine in the system.

<u>HEROIN</u>

Heroin, upstaged in the 1980's by the explosive growth of cocaine and crystal meth, nonetheless continues to be the primary "killer drug." The main culprit, "Mexican Tar", has a purity of 60-70% while heroin has historically been only 5-10% pure. Heroin was the leading cause of accidental drug-related deaths in San Diego County last year These deaths accounted for 53% (62 of 118) of the total. These numbers have been increasing each year for the last 5 years, while deaths attributed to cocaine and amphetamines have remained very static.

TARGET AREA

The primary target area for grant focus is located in the Southeast Area Command. The area is approximately 12 square blocks and contains a population of about 1,300 residents. The violent crime rate is 5 times the City average and the property crime rate is 1.5 times the City average.

DRUG ARREST PROFILE

Target area drug arrests were analyzed for the first six months or 1988, of the 210 drug arrests, the following profile emerges; BLACK MALE 21-30 YEARS.

		ARRESTEES	POPULATION
° <u>SEX</u>	Male Female	86% 14%	48% 52%
⁰ M?I	Black Hispanic White	78% 15% 7%	66% 37% 17%
° AGE	20 and under 21-30 31-40 Over 40	12% 54% 28% 6%	
o HIGHEST CHARGE (may not be drug related)	11550 (under the influ controlled subst		60%
	11350 (possession of controlled subst	cance)	13%
	11351.5 (possession of obase for sale)	cocaine	3%
	11364 (possession of instrument for a or smoking contr substance)		3%
	11352 (sale or transpo of controlled su		2%

0	TIME OF ARREST	0000-0359	19%
		0400-0759	3%
		0800-1159	7%
		1200-1559	8%
		1600-1959	27%
		2000-2359	36%
0	MONTH OF ARREST	January February March	25% 7% 16%
		April	8%
		May	22%
		June	27%

COMMUNITY SURVEY DESCRIPTION

The survey instrument that was developed for our Department contained about 30 questions. A much larger format with 100 questions was proposed, but we felt that this was too lengthy, even for a friendly neighborhood. The survey took about 10 minutes to administer, and even that seemed too long for many citizens.

As mentioned, the target area contains about 400 residences and businesses. The survey crew, composed of university students, walked the target area on Friday, Saturday and Sunday of one week from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. 180 surveys were administered, so nearly \ of the residences or businesses participated.

There was quite a bit of discussion about who would administer the survey, but most of us felt that citizens would be more apt to open up to a student than a uniformed officer. The response seemed to support this theory.

The students experienced very few problems. They marked 86% of the respondents as very cooperative and 98% as either very cooperative or somewhat cooperative. The students marked 80% of the respondents as seeming very honest and 94% as seeming either very honest or somewhat honest.

WHO WAS INTERVIEWED

The citizens interviewed were about 75% Black and 25% Hispanic. When asked what the head of the household did for a living, we obtained the following responses: Retired/Disabled - 35%, Services Industry - 20%, Labor - 16%, Civil Service - 6%, Nurse - 5%, Unemployed - 5%, Student - 4%.

When asked how long they had lived in their present residence, 1/4 stated they had lived there for more than 20 years, another 1/4 had lived there from 1 to 5 years, and only 17% had lived there less than 1 year. Clearly, this is not a neighborhood of transients.

How many people lived in the residence? 42% had 3 to 5 occupants, 27% had 2. Only 15% had 6 or more living in the residence.

What organizations do they belong to? Church - 63%, Community - 11%, PTA - 4%, Recreation - 3%, Political - 2%. Clearly, religion is a significant factor in their lives.

WHAT ARE THE NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS

When asked what were the JHG problems in the neighborhood, the citizens responded as follows: Drug sales, use - 68%, Young people hanging out - 64%, House/car breakins - 60%, Litter/trash - 56%, Vandalism - 47%. Clearly, selling and using drugs by neighborhood residents is the overwelming problem, coupled with young people hanging out - which go together.

When asked how visible do you feel drug dealing is in your neighborhood?, 52% said drug dealing is <u>VERY</u> visible. When asked if there was a particular house, apartment complex or business where drug users and dealers hang out, 42% said Yes, 21% said No, 34% didn't know.

THEIR PERCEPTION OF THEIR SAFETY

As we expected, fear plays a large part in these peoples lives. When asked if they felt safe to go out in the neighborhood, 59% replied that they felt safe only in the day time, 29% felt safe anytime and 12% never felt safe going out.

When the respondents were asked if their neighborhood had become a better place to live in the past year, they responded as follows:

Better - 34%, about the same - 32%, worse - 30%. Apparently, it has not changed in the past year.

Four of five respondents felt that their neighbors would call the police if they saw a crime taking place on the block. (This is encouraging). However, they felt these same people are reluctant to get involved beyond calling the police, as evidenced by responses to the question, "If you were robbed or assaulted out on the street, what do you think your neighbors would do?" Only 9% felt their neighbors would help stop it.

Probably the most enlightening response came to the question "Describe the level of control that you and your neighbors have over what goes on in your neighborhood. Only 7% felt they had a lot of control.

WHAT MEASURES ARE CITIZENS TAKING

Finally, the respondents were asked what measures they have taken in the past few years to protect themselves. Primarily, residents have secured their houses. We note that 34% state that they have joined Neighborhood Watch, but none of the watch programs in the target area have been active the last three years.

A couple of final words about the survey. We felt that, though there weren't many <u>BIG</u> surprises in the responses, we certainly have much more data to develop our plan. Without this process, we'd be relying on our best hunch as to how these people feel, and how they will react to increased police involvement in their neighborhood. Now we know that increased police presence is highly desired. We can proceed now with a great deal more confidence.

FINDINGS

- Based on cooperation with police survey, citizens are concerned, {citizen apathy would be the kiss of death to any police effort of this type).
- O A majority of the respondents go to church regularly. These churches could be powerful tools in organizing any effort.
- O The major problem in the target area is drug use and sales. 88% of those arrested for these offenses are 21 years of age or older. {They are NOT juveniles).
- 0 Most residents feel a lack of control over activities in their neighborhood. (Any plan must address this perception).
- O To survive, residents fortify their homes, stay inside, and don't get involved, beyond calling the police.
- Based on survey results, most would support efforts to improve the neighborhood. Their support at this time, however, would be minimal, because of their fear.

DRUG ARRESTS BY SAN DIEGO POLICE DEPARTMENT

1984 to 1987

				% Change
	1984	1986	1987	1984 - 1987
FELONY				
Adult	3,080	5,434	6,181	100.7
Juvenile	308	326	410	33.1
Total	3,388	5,760	6,591	94.5
MISDEMEANOR				
Adult	8,022	6,852	10,949	36.5
Juvenile	804	573	802	- 0.2
Total	8,826	7,426	11,751	33.1
TOTAL				
Adult	11,102	12,287	17,130	54.3
Juvenile	1,112	899	1,212	9.0
,				
GRAND TOTAL	12,214	13,186	18,342	50.2

ATTACHMENT B

ACTUAL CRIME

1980 - 1987

		•				Change
	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987	<u>1980-1987</u>
Homicide	103	72	103	101	96	- 1%
Robbery	2,986	3,142	2,616	3,985	3,452	+ 32%
Aggravate						
Assault	6,255	4,850	6,214	10,315	11,562	+ 12%
Burglary	19,960	16,214	15,248	17,533	17,370	+ 14%
Auto Theft	7,707	7,803	8,759	13,233	18,155	+107%
Total	37,011	32,081	32,940	45,167	50,635	+ 54%

ATTACHMENT C

NARCOTICS SEIZURES

1987 TOTALS

TYPE 1987 TOTALS

MARIJUANA 6,207.731bs

COCAINE 80.271bs

HEROIN 71bs 2ozs

OPIUM 681 bs

PLANTS 497

METHAPHETAMINE 259.641bs

OIL 125.5gals

ETHER 5gals

PCP lib 10.6oz

STICKS/SHERMS 374

LSD

DOSES/PILLS 392

PSILOCYBIN MUSHROOMS lib 3oz

HASHISH 1.44oz

CODEINE PILLS 254

OTHER PILLS 20 Valium

210 Misc.

LABS CLOSED 129

DRUG RELATED HOMICIDES 28

FIREARMS SEIZED 716

CASH \$1,189,895

ATTACHMENT D

DRUG RELATED DEATHS

SAN DIEGO COUNTY

DRUG	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
COCAINE	7	13	9	7	12
HEROIN/ MORPHINE	13	21	22	17	19
HEROIN IN COMBINATION	15	17	34	65	43
OTHER OPIATES	7	27	29	10	13
STIMULANTS	2	3	5	7	5
HYPNOTICS/ SEDATIVES	13	8	10	9	26
TOTAL	57	89	109	115	118

ATTACHMENT E

DRUG EMERGENCY ROOM MENTIONS

SAN DIEGO COUNTY

<u>DRUG</u>	1983	1984	1985	1S§§	<u>1987</u>
COCAINE	86	138	109	211	270
HEROIN/ MORPHINE	128	160	131	150	144
METHADONE	8	10	141	128	68
MARIJUANA	63	61	83	83	134
STIMULANTS	48	108	146	257	596
SEDATIVES/	305	305	214	214	32
PCP/ HALLUCINOGINS	66	56	50	50	

ATTACHHEKT F

PRIMARY DRUGS DETECTED

SAN DIEGO COUNTY CEHTRAL JAIL

DRUG	JUNE 1987	SEPTEMBER 1987 -	CHAN JANUARY 1988	GE JUNE - JANUARY
COCAINE	26%	44%	41%	15%
HEROIN	15%	24%	22%	1%
MARIJUANA 44%		44%	52%	8%
AMPHETAMINES	23%	18%	28%	5%
PCP 7%		4%	5%	net - 2 %
	<u></u>		·	
NUMBER INTERVIEWED	218	226	304	
NUMBER PROVIDING SPECIMEN	175	189	254	

Cownunity Survey

becau	ise w	e're i	I'm and this is We're doing a area in cooperation with the San Diego Police Department interested in crime problems in your neighborhood. Could you answering a few questions?
1.	How	long h	nave you lived in your current home?
	(1)	Less	than 1 year (4) 11 to 15 years
	(2)	1 to	5 years (5) 16 to 20 years
	(3)	6 to	10 years (6) more than 20 years
2.	How	many p	people, including yourself, live in your household?
	(1)	1	(3) 3 to 5
	(2)	2	(4) 6 or more
3.	Do y	ou owr	or rent the place in which you are currently living?
	(1)	Own	(2) Rent
What	are	<u>b</u> i£ pr	coblems in the neighborhood?
4.	(Y)	(N)	Vandalism, such as spray painting, breaking windows.
5.	(Y)	(N)	Abandoned buildings.
6.	(Y)	(N)	Litter or trash.
7.	(Y)	(N)	Vacant lots with trash.
8.	(Y)	(N)	Run-down properties.
9.	(Y)	(N)	People saying insulting things to others as they walk down
			the street.
10.	(Y)	(N)	Groups of young people hanging out on the street.
11.	(Y)	(N)	Disorderly crowds - people fighting or arguing outside.
12.	(Y)	(N)	People selling or using drugs.
13.	(Y)	(N)	People getting mugged on the street.
14.	(Y)	(N)	People getting their cars and houses broken into.
	Anv	other	problems?

15.	Are you presently a member of a		
	(1) Church or Religious Group	(4)	Community Group
	(2) Politically Oriented Group	(5)	Recreational or Other Social Group
	(3) PTA or Other School Group		<u>-</u>
16.	Have you been active in the group t	the pa	ast year?
	(1) Church or Religious Group	(4)	Community Group
	(2) Politically Oriented Group	(5)	Recreational or Other Social Group
	(3) PTA or Other School Group		
17.	Do other members of your household	belo	ng to these groups?
	(1) Church or Religious Group(2) Politically Oriented Group		<u> </u>
	(3) PTA or Other School Group		Gloup
18.	Does the group that you attend meet	in	this neighborhood?
	(1) Church or Religious Group	(4)	Community Group
	(2) Politically Oriented Group	(5)	Recreational or Other Social Group
	(3) PTA or Other School Group		
19.	How visible do you feel drug dealir	ng is	in your neighborhood?
	(1) Very visible	(3)	Hidden from the view of most people
20.	(2) Somewhat visibleIn the past year, would you say the better place to live, has stayed at(1) Better place to live	bout	ur neighborhood has become a
	(2) Has stayed about the same	(4)	Don't know
21.	Can you count on a neighbor to call taking place on the block?	l the	police 1f they see a crime
	(1) Yes	(2)	No

22.		you count on a neighbor to wate vity on your block?	ch out	for	suspicious people or
	(1)	Yes	(2)	No	
					
23.		ribe the level of control that goes on in your neighborhood?	you a	nd yo	our neighbors have over
	(1)	A lot of control	((3)	Little control
	(2)	Some control	((4)	No control at all
24.	neig	pose you were robbed or assault ghborhood. If your neighbors a y would do?			
	(1)	Call the police		(6)	Would ignore it
	(2)	Call someone else		(7)	Don't know
	(3)	Stop it themselves		(8)	Refused to answer
	(4)	Watch and investigate		(9)	Other:
	(5)	Wouldn't know what to do			
25.	Do y	ou feel safe to go out in your	neigh	borho	ood?
	(1)	Any time	(3)	Never	:
	(2)	Only during the day			
26.		ose your residence was broken in neighbors saw the burglar brea			
	(1)	Call the police		(6)	Would ignore it
	(2)	Call someone else		(7)	Don't know
	(3)	Stop it themselves		(8)	Refused to answer
	(4)	Watch and investigate		(9)	Other:
	(5)	Wouldn't know what to do			

In t	he past f	ew years, have you
27.	(Y) (N) Engraved identification on your valuables?
28.	(Y) (N)	Secured your home (locks, bars, alarm systems)?
29.	(Y) (N)	Joined a neighborhood watch program?
30.	(Y) (N)	Kept a gun in your home?
31.	(Y) (N)	Had a guard dog in your home?
32.	(Y) (N	Taken a course in self-defense?
	Other	
33.	In the p	ast year, have you or family members been the victim of a crime neighborhood?
	(Y) (N)	
34.	What doe	es the head of the household currently do for a living?
35.	How much	n responsibility do you feel for what happens on your block?
	(1) A	big responsibility (3) Not much responsibility
	(2) So	me responsibility (4) No responsibility
36.		a particular house, apartment complex or business in the mood where drug users and dealers hang out?
	(1) Yes	:(3) Don't know
	(2) No:	(4) Refused to answer
37.	If drug	use and sales are a problem in the neighborhood, is It usually individuals involved?
	(1) Yes	:(3) Don't know
	(2) No:	(4) Refused to answer

38. Do you have adequate transetc.	portation to get to work, sch	nool, shopping,
(1) Yes	(2) No	
That's all the questions we have anything you'd lik		
Thank you for your help!		

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS

Answer the following questions concerning your observations about the individual that you just interviewed.

1.	How	cooperative was the respon	ndent	?
	(1)	Very cooperative	(3)	Somewhat uncooperative
	(2)	Somewhat cooperative	(4)	Not at all cooperative
2.	How]	honest do you think the re	espon	dent was during the interview?
	(1)	Very honest	(2)	Somewhat dishonest
	(3)	Somewhat honest	(A)	Dishonest
3.	Your	estimate of the responder	nt's	understanding of the questions:
	(1)	Understood all questions	(2)	Misunderstood most questions
	(2)	Understood most questions	(3)	Misunderstood all questions
				•
			Inte	rviewers
				

Address	:					

Community Survey

Good morning,	I'm area in cooperation	and this is	We're	doing a
survey in the	area in cooperation	with the San Die	go Police Depart	ment
because we're	interested in crime	e problems in your	neighborhood.	Could you
help us out by	y answering a few qu	uestions?		_

- 1. How long have you lived in your current home?
 - (1) Less than 1 year 30 or 17% (4) 11 to 15 years 17 or 9%
 - (2) 1 to 5 years A3 or 24% (5) 16 to 20 years 13 or 7%
 - (3) 6 to 10 years 28 or 16% (6) more than 20 years 48 or 27%
- 2. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?
 - (1) 1 29 or 16% (3) 3 to 5 74 or 42%
 - (2) 2 48 or 27% (4) 6 or more 26 or 15%
- 3. Do you own or rent the place in which you are currently living?
 - (1) Own 94 or 53% (2) Rent 82 or 47%

What are <u>tmj</u> problems in the neighborhood?

- 4. (Y) (N) Vandalism, such as spray painting, breaking windows. Yes: ^Z or 47% No: 93 or 53%
- 5. (Y) (N) Abandoned buildings.

Yes:41 or 24% 133 or 76%

- 6. (Y) (N) Litter or trash.
 - Yes: 98 or 56% No: 76 or 44%
- (Y) (N) Vacant lots with trash.
 Yes: 62 or 36% No: 111 or 64%
- 8. (Y) (N) Run-down properties. Yes: 71 or 41% No: 104 or 59%
- 9. (Y) (N) People saying insulting things to others as they walk down the street.
- Yes: 81 or 46% No: 96 or 54% 10. (Y) (N) Groups of young people hanging out on the street.
- Yes: 114 or 64% No: 64 or 36% 11. (Y) (N) Disorderly crowds people fighting or arguing outside.
- Yes: 102 or 59% No: 70 or 41% 12. (Y) (N) People selling or using drugs.
- Yes: 120 or 68% No: 57 or 32%
- 13. (Y) (N) People getting mugged on the street.
 - Yes: 64 or 37% No: 111 or 63%
- 14. (Y) (N) People getting their cars and houses broken into.

 Yes: 104 or 60% No: 70 or 40%

 Any other problems?

15.	Are you presently a member of a		
	(1) Church or Religious Group	(4)	Community Group
	(2) Politically Oriented Group 4 or 2%	(5)	Recreational or Other Social Group 5 or 3%
	(3) PTA or Other School Group		
16.	Have you been active in the group	the p	ast year?
	(1) Church lor Berlig4 ous Group	(4)	Communaitor Gitos
	(2) Politically Oriented Group 4 or 2%	(5)	Recreational or Other Social Group 5 or 3%
	(3) PTA or Other School Group 8 or 5%		
17.	Do other members of your household	d belo	
	(1) Church of ⁴ Religious Group (2) Politically Oriented Group		Community Group Recreational or Other Social
	2 or 1%	` /	Group 5 or 3 [^]
	(3) PTA or Other School Group 3 or 2%		
18.	Does the group that you attend mee	et in	_
	41 or 23% (1) Church or Religious Group	(4)	10 or 6% Community Group
	(2) Politically Oriented Group 1 OF 1%	(5)	Recreational or Other Social Group ?.nr 9*
	(3) PTA or Other School Group		0 *
19.	How visible do you feel drug deali	ing is	in your neighborhood?
	(1) Very visible 91 or 52%	(3)	Hidden from the view of most people 24 or 14%
0.0	(2) Somewhat visible 26 or 15%		
20.	In the past year, would you say the better place to live, has stayed a	about t	the same or has gotten worse?
	(1) Better place to live 58 or 34%	(3)	Has gotten worse 51 or 30%
0.1	(2) Has staved about the same 55 or 32%	(4)	Don't know 7 or 4%
۷1.	Can you count on a neighbor to cal taking place on the block?	ı tne	police if they see a crime
	(1) Yes 133 or 79% ((₂) N	o 36 or 21%

* 22.			unt on n your	a neighl block?	bor to	o wa	tch ou	ıt for	suspic	cious pe	eople	or	
	U)	Yes	137 。	r 81%			(2)	No	33	or 198	Ś		
											_		
23.				l of co				and yo	our nei	ghbors	have	ove	er
	(1)	A lot	of cor	ntrol	n	or 1	18	(3)	Little	e contro	ol	54	or 32%
	(2)	Some	control		48	or 2	18%	(4)	No coi	ntrol a	t all	55	or 33%
24.	nei		ood. I	robbed f your 1									
	(1)	Call	the po	lice	121	or 7	1%	(6)	Would	ignore	it :	24 c	or 14%
	(2)	Call	someon	e else	4	or	1%	(7)	Don't	know	0		
	(3)	Stop	it the	mselves	16	or	9%	(8)	Refuse	ed to a	nswer	Ç)
	(4)	Watc:	h and i	nvestiga	ate 4	or	2%	(9)	Other:				
	(5)	Woul	dn't kn	ow what	to do)	2 or 3	1%		<u> </u>			
25.	Do у	ou fee	l safe	to go o	ut in	you	r neig	ghborho	ood?				
	(1)	Any t	ime 4	9 or 29	%		(3)	Never	21	or 12%			
	(2)	Only	during	the day	101	or	5 <u>9</u> %						
26.				dence wa w the bi									
	(1)	Call	the pol	ice	125	or	75%	(6)	Would	ignore	it	24	or 14%
	(2)	Call	someone	else	2.	or	1%	(7)	Don't	know	0		
	(3)	Stop	it them	selves	1	or	1	(8)	Refuse	ed to ar	nswer		Q
	(4)	Watch	and in	vestigat	te 2	or	1	(9)	Other:				
	(5)	Would	n't kno	w what t	o do	1 o	r 1%						

TII (the past lew years, have you	
27. 28. 29. 30.	(Y) (N) Engraved identification Yes: 38 or 22% No: 135 or 78% (Y) (N) Secured your home (lock Yes: 125 or 72% No: 48 or 28% (Y) (N) Joined a neighborhood Yes: 58 or 34% No: 113 or 66% (Y) (N) Kept a gun in your home Yes: 38 or 22% No: 137 or 78% (Y) (N) Had a guard dog in your Yes: 45 or 26% No: 128 or 74% (Y) (N) Taken a course in self Yes: 21 or 12% No: 149 or 88% Other	watch program? see? fr home? defense?
33.	In the past year, have you or famin your neighborhood? year, have you or famin your neighborhood? No. 7, 7, 7, 8, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10	nily members been the victim of a crime or 117 or 68%
34.	What does the head of the househ	old currently do for a living?
35.	How much responsibility do you f (1) A big responsibility (3)	eel for what happens on your block?
	63 or 38% (2) Some responsibility (4) 49 or 30%	33 or 20% No responsibility 21 or 13%
36.	Is there a particular house, apar neighborhood where drug users and	
	(1) Yes: 76 or 42%	(3) Don't know 61 or 34%
	(2) No: 38 or 21%	(4) Refused to answer 4 or 2%
37.	If drug use and sales are a probl the same individuals involved?	em in the neighborhood, is it usually
	(1) Yes: 64 or 38%	(3) Don't know 68 or 40%
	(2) No: 37 or 22%	(4) Refused to answer 1 or 1%

38.	Do you have adequate transportation etc.	n to	get t	to work,	school,	shopping
	(1) Yes 151 or 88%	(2)	No	21 or	12%	
		· -		<u> </u>		
That	t's all the questions we have.					
Do 7	you have anything you'd like to add	l?				
						-
						_

Thank you for your help!

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS

Answer the following questions concerning your observations about the individual that you just interviewed.

1.	How	cooperative	was	the	respondent?
----	-----	-------------	-----	-----	-------------

- (1) Very cooperative 146 or 86%
- (3) Somewhat uncooperative

1 or 1%

- (2) Somewhat cooperative 21 or 12%
- (4) Not at all cooperative 1 or 1%
- 2. How honest do you think the respondent was during the interview?
 - (1) Very honest

(2) Somewhat dishonest

- (3^t) 135 or 80% Somewhat honest 24 or 14%
- 9 or S% (4) Dishonest 1 or 1%
- 3. Your estimate of the respondent's understanding of the questions:
 - (1) Understood all questions 128 or 75%
 - 128 or 75%
 (2) Understood most questions
 40 or 24%
- (3) Misunderstood most questions
 1 or 1?
- (4) Misunderstood all
 questions
 1 or 1%

Interviewers	