

11-3-2000

# Information Report on Burglary in Multnomah County

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub)



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

## Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Information Report on Burglary in Multnomah County" (2000). *City Club of Portland*. 503.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub/503](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/503)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

Information Report on  
**Burglary in Multnomah County**

City Club of Portland Bulletin  
Vol. 69, No. 14  
September 2, 1988

[NOTE: Because this report carries no conclusions  
or recommendations, no official action is  
required of the membership.]

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SUMMARY . . . . .	71
I.    INTRODUCTION . . . . .	71
A.    Charge to the Committee . . . . .	71
B.    Legal Definition of Burglary . . . . .	72
II.   BURGLARY RATES:  EVALUATING CONSISTENCY AMONG CITIES . . . . .	72
III.  CHARACTERISTICS OF BURGLARY . . . . .	73
A.    Who Commits Burglary . . . . .	73
1.    Age . . . . .	73
2.    Education . . . . .	74
3.    Race . . . . .	74
4.    Substance Abuse . . . . .	74
B.    Ways Burglaries are Committed . . . . .	75
C.    When Burglaries are Committed . . . . .	76
D.    Where Burglaries are Committed . . . . .	76
IV.   STOLEN PROPERTY:  VALUE & DISPOSAL . . . . .	76
V.    COMBATTING BURGLARY . . . . .	77
A.    Role of Portland Police Bureau . . . . .	77
B.    Jails and Prisons . . . . .	79
C.    Juvenile Programs . . . . .	80
1.    Project Return . . . . .	81
2.    Police Activities . . . . .	81
3.    Portland School District Number 1 . . . . .	82
D.    Citizen Efforts . . . . .	82
1.    Site-hardening . . . . .	82
2.    Alarms . . . . .	83
3.    Insurance . . . . .	83
4.    Neighborhood Crime Watch . . . . .	84
5.    Private Patrols . . . . .	84
APPENDIX A:    Persons Interviewed . . . . .	86
APPENDIX B:    Bibliography . . . . .	87

Information Report on  
BURGLARY IN MULTNOMAH COUNTY

To the Board of Governors,  
City Club of Portland:

SUMMARY

1. The Multnomah County burglary rate appears higher than other comparable communities because of Portland's **relatively high reportability rate**. This may be due at least in part to Portland's relative ease of reporting crime. Data show that the burglary rate now appears to be decreasing.
2. A small **number of very active burglars** commit a significant percentage of the burglaries. This suggests, according to some experts, that a program directed toward individuals could prove effective.
3. **Drug abuse** is a substantial factor in burglaries, affecting at least half of all burglary suspects arrested.
4. There is a perceived shortage of **incarceration space and sentencing alternatives** in Multnomah County and state Corrections Department facilities. Nonetheless, it would appear unreasonable to place the entire blame for the high reported burglary rate on the lack of jail or prison capacity.
5. There appear to be no effective **sanctions for truants** or their parents.
6. A **concerned and active public** can play an important part in reducing burglary, through site-hardening and by being more alert about suspicious persons and more attentive to the source of questionable goods.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Charge to the Committee

Over the past few years, numerous news articles and statistics have been published designating Portland as a city with an exceptional burglary problem. Concern about the rate of reported burglary in the metropolitan area led the City Club of Portland to establish a Burglary Study Committee to investigate and report on the rate of burglary in Multnomah County, and to evaluate efforts to address the problem. The Committee was also charged to consider changes in the level and types of efforts used to address burglary.

Because available statistics are most commonly derived from cities rather than counties, much of the data herein is

based on Portland. However, your Committee submits that the findings are applicable to Multnomah County and are not limited to the City of Portland.

#### B. Legal Definition of Burglary

In Oregon, when a person enters or remains unlawfully in a building with intent to commit a crime, the person commits second degree burglary, a Class C felony (ORS 164.215), which is punishable by up to five years in prison and/or a \$100,000 fine (ORS 161.605; ORS 161.625). If the burglary is committed in a residence, or if the burglar is armed with a burglar's tool or a deadly weapon, uses or threatens to use a dangerous weapon, or causes or attempts to cause physical injury to someone, then the burglar commits the Class A felony of first degree burglary (ORS 164.225). Class A felonies are punishable by imprisonment up to twenty years and/or a \$100,000 fine (ORS 161.605; ORS 161.625).

#### II. BURGLARY RATES: EVALUATING CONSISTENCY AMONG CITIES

It has been widely reported that the burglary rate in Portland is one of the highest in the nation. Upon investigation of Portland's burglary rate, your Committee determined that various factors affecting burglary may differ substantially among cities. Your Committee does not suggest that these factors negate the high rate evident in Portland as compared to other cities, but believes that an understanding of them is necessary when examining comparative rates.

Burglary rates are in reality reported burglary rates. A true representation of the incidence of burglary could be obtained through the performance of a victimization study in which all residents in a specified area are surveyed to assess the number of burglaries committed. However, due to the time and expense required by victimization studies, reported crimes are the common method used by law enforcement and the media for determining numbers and rates.

Reported rates cannot be equated to victimization study rates because many burglaries are not reported. The National Crime Survey of the Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates that only about 50 percent of all burglaries are actually reported. In contrast to the national reporting percentages, a Portland Police Bureau (PPB) crime prevention analyst interviewed by your Committee estimated that approximately 80 percent of Portland burglaries are reported. These estimates were consistent with estimates made by Dr. Norval Morris, noted criminologist, who addressed the City Club on May 27, 1988.

Ease of reporting and confidence in law enforcement agencies provide a possible explanation for the higher reported rates in Portland. Therefore, comparisons between

Portland and other cities must be carefully examined before drawing conclusions about rates.

There are four ways Portland residents can report a burglary: 1) an officer visiting the burglarized premises, 2) the victim writing a report to the police, 3) the victim visiting a police facility to make a report, or 4) the victim telephoning a report to the police.

It is important to examine the availability of personnel to accept reports. Table 1 reveals that Portland provides a greater number of personnel to take telephone reports.

TABLE I  
Police Personnel Available for Telephone Reporting

<u>City</u>	<u>Number of Telephone Personnel</u>	<u>Hours of Operation</u>
Buffalo	0	None
Cincinnati	3	7 am - 2 am
Kansas City	0	None
Long Beach	6	12 pm - 8 pm
Minneapolis	8	8 am - 12 pm
<b>Portland</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6 am to 1 am</b>
Seattle	0	None
Tulsa	5	8 am - 4 pm

Source: Portland Police Bureau, Comparison Urban Rate of Burglary Report, 1985.

### III. CHARACTERISTICS OF BURGLARY

#### A. Who Commits Burglary

##### 1. Age

Males 15 to 29 years old are the most likely to commit burglary and other crimes. The crime rate fluctuates in proportion to the size of this group.

In 1980, males in the 15 to 29 year old age group constituted 14 percent of the population of the Portland metropolitan area. In Multnomah County, the number of males in this age group declined 18 percent between 1980 and 1985, and is predicted to decline 17 percent between 1985 and 1990, and 7 percent between 1990 and 1995. A slight increase is expected after this period. Therefore, Multnomah County's male population aged 15 to 29 will decrease by 36 percent between 1980 and 1995. (PSU Center for Population Research). As will be discussed later, burglaries decreased slightly between 1984 and 1987 after initially increasing.

## 2. Education

Your Committee was unable to obtain current statistics on the educational level of burglars. However, a 1972 study prepared for the Oregon Law Enforcement Council showed that the majority of adults convicted of residential (79%) and nonresidential (63%) burglary did not graduate from high school. In addition, 50 percent of residential and 34 percent of nonresidential burglars had been disciplinary problems at school. Of the juveniles, 18 percent dropped out of school prior to their referral to the criminal justice system, 64 percent had a history of disciplinary problems in school, and 4 percent had been identified in the school system as delinquent.

## 3. Race

Arrest statistics show that approximately 20 percent of burglary arrests in Portland involve blacks, who constitute approximately five percent of Portland's population. Ron Herndon, co-chair of the Black United Front, contends that the disproportionate involvement of blacks in crime results from failure of the educational and social systems to provide blacks with adequate education and training.

## 4. Substance Abuse

Multnomah County Circuit Court Judge Phillip Abraham says that more than half of the burglars he sees have drug problems. Although data specific to burglary is not available, Oregon Board of Parole data indicates that 67 percent of all probationers and 72 percent of all prisoners have some drug or alcohol history.

Last year the National Institute of Justice released a draft of a current national statistical study that attempted to forecast the relationship between drug use and crime. Sample surveys involved men arrested for non-drug related crimes in seven cities: New York; Portland; Washington, D.C.; Phoenix; New Orleans; San Diego and Indianapolis. In this study, Portland ranked near the middle with respect to the rate at which suspects tested positive for drugs. The National Institute of Justice stated that other studies show that an individual's crime rate is two to six times higher when abusing drugs as compared to relatively drug-free periods.

Many witnesses before your Committee said that a substantial number of burglaries relate directly to drug use. Oregon Attorney General David Frohnmayer said it costs about \$17,000 a year to support a tar heroin habit. Because stolen goods sell for about 10 percent of their value,

Frohnmayr estimated that an addict would have to burglarize \$170,000 worth of goods annually to support a drug habit. Given an average value of \$1,000 per reported burglary (1986 PPB Annual Report), this would require 170 burglaries per year to support one burglar's habit.

Your Committee asked the police to estimate the daily cost of cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines and other drugs believed to be commonly used in Portland. Captain Brooks of the PPB furnished the following data:

TABLE II  
Estimated Daily Cost of Drug Use

<u>Drug*</u>	<u>Minimum Cost Per Day</u>	<u>Maximum Cost Per Day</u>
Heroin	\$100	\$400
Cocaine (including crack)	20	500
Methamphetamine (speed)	20	100

\*The PPB was unable to estimate the use and daily cost of other forms of illegal drugs.

B. Ways Burglaries are Committed

Burglary can be committed in a myriad of ways. The 1972 Oregon Law Enforcement Council study of burglaries in Portland found that forced entry was used in 59 percent of burglaries, no force was used in 34 percent, and 6 percent of attempts were unsuccessful. Table III presents the method of entry by residential and nonresidential burglaries from data obtained from that study.

TABLE III  
Method of Entry

	<u>Forced Entry</u>	<u>Entry</u>		<u>Location</u>		
		<u>Doors</u>	<u>Windows</u>	<u>Front</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>Rear</u>
Residential	62%	51%	49%	22%	28%	50%
Nonresidential	55%	50%	50%	25%	56%	20%

Some burglaries are committed by more than one burglar. The PPB currently estimates that one person is involved 50 percent of the time, two persons 45 percent of the time, and three persons 5 percent of the time. (1986 PPB Annual Report)



### C. When Burglaries are Committed

The PPB 1986 Annual Report listed burglaries by hours of occurrence. Not surprisingly, the highest percentage of residential burglaries occur during daylight hours when most people are at work. Of business burglaries, the largest proportion occur during the night hours.

### D. Where Burglaries are Committed

Burglary rates clearly differ by geographic area. As is evident in Table IV, between 1984 and 1986, when the overall city rate dropped, five of the eight neighborhoods experienced increased burglary rates. In 1987, rates for most neighborhoods fell well below the 1984 level. The annexation of neighborhoods in outer Northeast and outer Southeast contributed minimally to the change in those areas.

TABLE IV

#### Residential Burglary Rate per 100 Households

<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
North	7.99	7.51	7.47	6.06
Inner NE	10.68	10.89	10.91	10.70
Outer NE	4.52	4.46	4.53	4.00
Inner SE	4.92	4.86	5.31	4.53
Outer SE	5.96	6.11	6.42	5.35
SW	3.31	3.99	4.06	3.92
NW	3.04	3.12	3.04	2.64
Downtown	2.54	2.48	2.21	1.94
TOTAL	6.15	5.82	5.92	5.36

Source: PPB Residential Burglary Crime Statistics 1984-87.

### IV. STOLEN PROPERTY: VALUE & DISPOSAL

The value of items taken in reported burglaries is determined by victims' estimates. In the ten years from 1976 to 1986, PPB annual reports state that the value of stolen items increased from \$5 million (in 1976) to \$17 million (in 1986). The average amount taken per burglary in 1986 was \$976.

The harm to the burglary victim extends beyond the economic value of the property taken. The dollar value of stolen items does not include the sentimental value of family heirlooms, property damage caused by forced entries, or personal injury. In addition many victims express a sense

of personal invasion because an unwelcome stranger has intruded into their private property.

Law enforcement personnel believe that some stolen property is sold from the trunks of cars to otherwise law abiding citizens. Other stolen property is disposed of at pawnshops, flea markets and similar outlets or sold to second hand dealers in Portland. Some is shipped out of state.

Portland regulates precious metal and gem dealers and secondhand dealers pursuant to City Code Chapter 14.37. Recently, a new city ordinance was adopted strengthening the city's pawnshop laws. The City requires dealers to 1) register, 2) obtain identification from each seller, 3) complete a PPB form applicable to each item purchased, 4) make a copy of such forms available to the PPB on a daily basis, and 5) hold the purchased property for at least 15 days. Violations are punishable upon conviction by a fine of not more than \$500.

The PPB's pawn shop detail consists of one or two officers who visit pawn shops on a daily basis, although not every pawn shop is visited every day. Police check whether pawn shops are complying with the pawn shop ordinance and whether serial numbers of pawned items match serial numbers of stolen items. However, even when dealers obtain identification from sellers, the identification may be forged, stolen, or otherwise inaccurate. The pawn shop detail reported to your Committee that it lacks the computer capability and personnel needed to make serial number and other information available promptly.

## V. COMBATTING BURGLARY

### A. Role of Portland Police Bureau

The Portland Police budget for the 1987-88 fiscal year is \$48,536,339, an increase of about 20 percent from 1977-78, adjusted for inflation. Portland's boundaries did expand during this period but the number of sworn officers per 1,000 population decreased from 1.95 to 1.8 officers from 1975 to 1986. (PPB 1986 Annual Report)

A citizen may call "911" to report a burglary. The call is categorized into a high or low priority. High priority calls are those where a burglary is in process and three units will be dispatched. "Cold" burglaries receive a lower priority. Response to burglaries more than 24 hours old and involving less than \$200 is limited to taking information over the phone.

Responses to burglary are handled initially by patrol officers who report to the scene and write an incident report. Leads indicating that a suspect may be nearby are followed up immediately. The identification unit is called if

there are usable fingerprints. The records division codes, classifies and numbers the case, and records available serial numbers of stolen property. The division attempts to enter information within one day, but it is not able to do so on a consistent basis because of personnel shortages. When completed, a copy of the report is sent to the detective division's burglary detail where cases are assigned.

Investigation of a "garden variety" burglary, with a door or window broken and no special circumstances usually ends at this point. If fingerprints are found, a search is made but the PPB does not have a computer-assisted search system and it is rare that an arrest can be made on the basis of a fingerprint. Recognition of links or similarities between burglaries is dependent upon the insight of the detectives or the uniformed officer working in the area.

According to a PPB burglary detective, the burglary detail usually has eight persons working the day shift and seven to eight persons working the night shift. Of the 17,324 burglary cases reported during 1986, approximately 1,000 cases were assigned per detective. Detectives also are responsible for investigating other property crimes.

In 1985, the PPB established a Burglary Task Force to develop a comprehensive set of programs to reduce burglary. The Task Force did not determine why Portland has a relatively high reported burglary rate. The Task Force report recommended that, without jail space availability, the Bureau should concentrate on prevention. Aside from the report, the PPB said it lacks a master plan on how to deal with burglary. Its response to burglary is reactive rather than proactive. The bureau does, however, address burglaries based on patterns in specific areas.

Law enforcement officials consistently told the Committee that a large number of burglaries are committed by a small number of very active burglars. Your Committee asked the PPB to estimate of the number of burglaries committed by the most active burglars during a year's period. The following estimates were provided by the Burglary Detail of the Portland Police Bureau:

TABLE V  
Estimate of Burglaries Committed  
by the Most Active Burglars

# of Burglars		# of Burglaries Per Year Per Burglar
Adults	Juveniles	
4	1	300-400
5	0	200-299
5	3	100-199
16	2	50- 99

The ten most active burglars in the sample committed an estimated total of 2,350 burglaries in one year -- an average of 235 burglaries per year or about 20 burglaries per month. These ten burglars accounted for 11 percent of all estimated burglaries committed, and 14 percent of all reported burglaries committed in one year. Beyond that, police estimate that 48 persons were responsible for 4,435 burglaries during one year, or 21 percent of the 20,785 total.

In the early 1980's, the PPB attempted to identify and arrest the most active burglars through a pilot, Project Mercury. However, due apparently to insufficient funding, this effort met with limited success. Approximately three years ago, the PPB established a Tactical Investigation Detail which has been involved in the identification, surveillance and apprehension of some of the most active burglars. This operation appears to have been successful but because only six personnel are assigned to the Detail, the Detail's operations have had little effect on the burglary rate.

On the state level, Governor Goldschmidt has proposed a Parole Violators Project which, if funded, will provide a guaranteed, tough sanction for high volume property criminals and will remove those criminals from the streets when they violate the terms of their parole.

#### B. Jails and Prisons

A common view of witnesses interviewed by your Committee was that the lack of jail/prison bed space was an important, if not the most important, factor in Portland's high reported burglary rate. Circuit court judges stated that because of the lack of prison space, repeat burglars sentenced to five or more years in the state system can serve less than a year. For this reason, judges often sentence burglars to the county jail for up to one year, followed by probation. This insures that those convicted serve some time and allows judges some leverage in dealing with them after release.

The final report of a Jail Space Task Force, released Jan. 10, 1986, illustrated a few case histories:

-- In eight years, a man of 25 had been arrested for burglary four times, as well as for attempted murder, robbery, car theft, and being an ex-convict in possession of a firearm. His arrest total included 13 felonies and 57 misdemeanors. Today he is on the street, on probation.

-- Another 25 year old man accumulated 16 felony arrests and 16 misdemeanor arrests in nine years, including six arrests for burglary and three for robbery. In just over two weeks, he was arrested on three separate burglary-related charges, yet at least once he was released with a citation because there was no room for him in jail.

Questions about repeated arrests are pertinent: How often are suspects who are on release pending trial arrested on another charge while they are free? Police had no information. How often are ex-prisoners arrested on new charges after their release from jail or prison? The district attorney said the recidivism rate for home burglars was "as high as 80 percent".

The sentencing practices in two counties in Washington with burglary rates lower than Portland's were considered as possible differentiating factors. In Clark County (Vancouver), a convicted burglar with no prior record and not using a deadly weapon could get a 90 day jail sentence. In King County (Seattle), a convicted burglar could get 90 days on first offense, three to nine months in jail on second offense, and 12 to 14 months in prison for a third conviction. An earned early release can reduce sentences by as much as one third (the average reduction is 20 percent).

Your Committee interviewed officials in many other jurisdictions similar in size to Portland to determine whether any new programs had been implemented to address burglary. Santa Clara County, California, indicated that a decrease in all categories of crime had occurred since California passed legislation increasing actual time served. However, since this decrease is consistent with state and national trends, it is difficult to draw a conclusion. Other jurisdictions were unable to provide evidence of effective efforts to combat burglary.

According to Charles Silberman in his book, Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice, the prospect of serving time does not deter all potential burglars. Some either do not expect to be caught or are not concerned about going to jail or prison. But punishment to some does inhibit others; many ex-offenders list their prison experience as a reason for "going straight." To some extent, the certainty of punishment rather than tougher sentences is a deterrent.

Jail space is expensive. New medium and maximum security prison capital costs per bed total \$55,000 and \$75,000 respectively. Annual operating costs are estimated at \$13,975 per prisoner. So incarcerating the ten most active burglars could require \$550,000 to \$750,000 in capital costs for new beds and \$139,750 per year in operations. If the 48 most active were imprisoned, capital costs would increase to \$2,640,000 to \$3,600,000 and operations to \$670,800 per year. Converting facilities used for other purposes or expanding existing facilities could reduce the capital costs.

### C. Juvenile Programs

Juveniles are responsible for a substantial portion of burglaries, but since 1978, there has been a significant increase in adult burglar arrests and reduction in juvenile arrests in Multnomah County. In 1977, arrests by age group

were approximately equal (477 juvenile arrests, 465 adult arrests). But in 1986, only 299 juveniles were arrested compared to 881 adults. Your Committee was not able to ascertain whether this arrest data changed because juvenile offenders have received less attention in the past few years.

Several witnesses cited a flaw in current juvenile statutes which in their opinion contributes to burglary. Oregon law, ORS 419.575(2)(a), now provides that a juvenile may only be detained for up to three hours when necessary to obtain the child's name, age, residence, and other identifying information. If a juvenile is not considered a threat to others or is not in immediate danger, the child can be released to the custody of his/her parents. If no guardian is available, if the child is twelve years or older, and if the police believe the child will appear for hearing, the child is simply released back on the street. Most police agencies feel that the maximum three hour holding time limits their ability to investigate fully a juvenile suspect's involvement in a crime, and the ability of counselors to be effective.

Thus, it is not clear whether the reduced percentage of juvenile burglary arrests is due to changes in enforcement emphasis, changes in the numbers of juveniles, or changes in burglary habits. However, juveniles still are responsible for a substantial number of burglaries.

A majority of burglaries occur during the day; truant juveniles on the street may be involved in burglaries. Portland Public Schools confront truancy problems with school visits by law enforcement officers and through Project Return.

#### 1. Project Return

Portland Public Schools and the Portland Police Bureau initiated Project Return in the fall of 1985. It is a major effort to identify students who have dropped out of school or are likely to drop out of school and get them back through referral services.

Project Return coordinators say the greatest single obstacle to reducing truancy is the lack of consequences to a child for being truant. Evaluations of the Project Return program do not document any decline in truancy.

#### 2. Police Activities

Portland Police do not have written procedures for dealing specifically with juveniles found out of school during school hours, but as a matter of practice officers can take truant juveniles into custody. As time permits, officers routinely contact juveniles to see if the juvenile should be in school. If the juvenile is truant, the officer may take

the juvenile to school, home or a youth service center. Each case is followed with a written report detailing of the contact and disposition of the juvenile. A copy of the juvenile report is directed to Multnomah County Juvenile Services for follow-up and action.

### 3. Portland School District Number 1

When a student has missed more than ten consecutive days of school, the student is dropped from enrollment as determined by state guidelines. It is rare that any court action is taken against students who don't attend.

Information on students who are absent from school is not routinely made available to law enforcement agencies. Legally requested information about the attendance record of an individual student will be provided.

During the 1986-87 school year, School District No. 1 instituted two test programs to improve high school attendance. They are (1) a computerized telephone call home system in each high school to notify parents of a student's absence, and (2) a test project at Cleveland High School to implement new follow-up procedures in response to student absences.

## D. Citizen Efforts

A concerned and active public can help prevent burglaries. Home residents may observe unusual or suspicious activities in their neighborhoods and can notify police promptly of any such activity. Residents can mark their possessions with an engraved number (usually an Oregon driver's license number), record product serial numbers, and take pictures or a video tape of their possessions to facilitate identification. Citizens can avoid buying property at a price or under circumstances indicating that the property might be stolen. Residents may "harden" their homes (i.e., make it more difficult for burglars to gain easy access), install an alarm system, and can work with or help fund a neighborhood patrol to observe and report suspicious activities. Each of these options is described more fully below.

### 1. Site-hardening

The estimated cost of "hardening" a residence with dead-bolt locks and window and sliding-door restraints is \$30 per door and \$1 per window. Without attempting entrance, a burglar cannot see that one home is more secure than another, but former burglars say that homes which can be entered more quickly, easily, and safely are chosen over those more difficult to burglarize.

In March 1983, Portland Police published an "Evaluation of the Home Security Program" that analyzed 300 households before and after "hardening". The study showed 34 forced entry burglaries before hardening and 13 after hardening. The forced entry rate after hardening was 1.4 burglaries per 100 households in contrast to the city-wide rate of 3.0 per 100. This information seems to show that site-hardening is a cost-effective method of deterring burglary.

## 2. Alarms

An increasing number of citizens are installing residential burglar alarms. The Oregonian (January 10, 1986) estimated that more than 20,000 business and residential alarms have been installed in Multnomah County.

Several companies offer a variety of systems that can be designed to secure doors or detect movements of an intruder. According to the Oregon Burglar and Fire Alarm Association, the cost of equipping a two-story, 2,400 square foot home having three entrance doors ranges from \$354 to \$985. The monthly monitoring charge is about \$20.

The association reported that because most residential burglars are unsophisticated, the chances of their defeating an alarm system or cutting telephone lines is low. A window sticker warning that an alarm system is in operation may also be a deterrent.

## 3. Insurance

Insurance costs for homeowners and renters are based on a number of factors including the age of the dwelling, construction type, frequency of loss in a "rate" area, and the potential of "perils" including fire, lightning, vandalism, and theft.

Until recently, Portland homeowners' insurance premiums were among the lowest in the state because of the quality of the city's fire protection system. Now Portland premiums are among the highest in the state because high burglary and robbery rates offset fire protection savings.

One insurance company compared its fire losses with its crime losses, including burglary. In 1986, it had residential crime losses in Multnomah County of \$2.8 million and fire losses of slightly over \$1 million. In Washington County, this company's crime losses were \$1.2 million and fire losses were \$154,000; in Clackamas County, its crime losses were \$1 million and fire losses \$640,000. For this carrier, crime costs per policy were \$88 in Multnomah County, \$65 in Clackamas County, and \$50 in Washington County.



If crime losses can be reduced, insurance premiums can be reduced or at least increases can be mitigated. The five largest insurance companies in Oregon provide discounts ranging from 5 to 15 percent for fire and crime prevention equipment such as smoke detectors, fire extinguishers, dead bolt locks and alarm systems. All insurance company representatives told your Committee that their companies strongly supported Neighborhood Watch programs.

#### 4. Neighborhood Crime Watch

The Neighborhood Crime Prevention Program was established in 1978 and originally was funded by the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Currently part of the Portland Neighborhood Association program, eight neighborhood crime prevention offices promote a program to develop and maintain neighborhood crime and business watches, increase public awareness about crime prevention, and identify neighborhood problem spots. Individual Neighborhood Watch programs encourage people to become acquainted with their block's residents and activities, learn how to recognize and report suspicious individuals or vehicles to the police, and establish communications within the neighborhood and with the city administration.

A block coordinator is responsible for monitoring the system and acting as a liaison with the neighborhood association coordinator. The block coordinator urges neighbors to participate and distributes block maps, telephone numbers, and Neighborhood Watch stickers. The coordinator has information about engraving tools and may collect money to buy Neighborhood Watch signs. Through the coordinator police will arrange for home security surveys and teach neighbors how to report usable information about suspicious activity and how and when to report a crime.

The success of a Neighborhood Watch program depends on the leadership abilities of the block coordinator. Most programs lapse within 18 months unless residents are committed and block coordinators are enthusiastic. Currently in Portland, 2,000 blocks are organized with 25,000 to 30,000 neighbors involved. There is no data on the effectiveness of this program.

#### 5. Private Patrols

Security companies may be hired to patrol residential neighborhoods at a cost based on the number of paying homes. One company charges \$5 per month per home to patrol 100 or more paying homes for seven hours from 9 p.m. to 4 a.m. A 24-hour patrol costs approximately \$10 per home per

month. Companies contacted by the committee were unable to provide any measure of effectiveness of residential patrols in reducing burglary rates.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Armstrong  
Florence Berman  
Cynthia Brown  
Susan Crane  
Bob Morris  
Kari Stanley  
Robert Vetto  
Dee Jay Wolfe  
Chuck Best, Chair

Gratitude is expressed to Leonard Girard, former Chair, whose guidance was invaluable during the early stages of the committee's work.

Approved by the Research Board on June 16, 1988 for submittal to the Board of Governors. Approved by the Board of Governors on July 25, 1988 for publication. NOTE: BECAUSE THIS REPORT CARRIES NO CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS, NO OFFICIAL ACTION IS REQUIRED OF THE MEMBERSHIP.

Appendix A  
PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Philip Abraham, Multnomah County Circuit Court Judge  
Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County Commissioner  
Dave Austin, Portland Police Bureau  
Tim Baird, Case Manager, Greenhouse Project  
Al Beachal, Gateway Loan and Discount Center  
John Beatty, Senior Circuit Court Judge  
Kathleen Bogan, Executive Director, Oregon Criminal Justice  
Council  
Dick Bogle, City Commissioner  
Alcena Boozer, Coord. Student Discipline Programs, Portland  
Public Schools  
Captain Robert Brooks, Portland Police Bureau  
Neil Chambers, State Department of Corrections, Information  
Systems Division  
Helen Cheek, Coordinator, Inner SE Neighborhood Crime  
Prevention  
Mayor Bud Clark  
Joyce Cohen, State Senator  
Charles Crookham, Multnomah County Circuit Court Judge  
Marilyn Curry, Senior Deputy District Attorney  
Dennis Daly, Data Services, Portland Police Bureau  
Captain Jim Davis, former Police Chief  
Chuck Duffy, Assistant to Mayor Clark  
James Ellis, Multnomah County Circuit Court Judge  
Tom English, Director, Juvenile Services Commission  
Kathy Farr, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Portland State  
University  
Charles Foley, Agent, State Farm Insurance  
David Frohnmayer, Oregon Attorney General  
David Fuks, Director, Regional Drug Initiative  
Stephen Gallagher, Jr., Multnomah County Circuit Judge  
David Gonzales, Director, Adolescent/Parent Program, Urban  
League of Portland  
Jean Gordon, Planning and Research, Portland Police Bureau  
Penny Harrington, former Police Chief  
Jim Hennings, Director, Metropolitan Public Defender's Office  
Ron Herndon, Co-Chair, Black United Front  
Steve Hykal, Claim Supervisor, State Farm Insurance  
Annette Jolin, former Professor of Administration of  
Justice, Portland State University  
Steve Kapsh, former Executive Director, Prison Overcrowding  
Project  
Janet Klapstein, Deputy District Attorney, Multnomah County  
Dale Lange, Staff Development Specialist, Multnomah  
Education Service District  
Susan Booth Larson, Law Related Education, Multnomah  
Education Service District

Sid Lezak, former U.S. Attorney for Oregon  
 Harley Leiber, Director, Multnomah County Community Corrections  
 Mike McCluhan, Planning and Research, Portland Police Bureau  
 Sharon McCormack, Coordinator, NE Neighborhoods Against Crime  
 Dwayne McNannay, Assistant Director, Multnomah County Juvenile Court  
 Babette Means, Neighborhood Information Profiles Coordinator  
 Keith Meisenheimer, Senior Deputy District Attorney, Multnomah County  
 Caroline Miller, Multnomah County Commissioner  
 Hal Ogburn, Director, Multnomah County Juvenile Court  
 James O'Leary, Clackamas County District Attorney  
 Kevin O'Malley, Oregon Burglar and Fire Alarm Association  
 Fred Pearce, Multnomah County Sheriff  
 Tim Person, Claims Superintendent, State Farm Insurance  
 Lieutenant Robert Peshka, Burglary Detective, Portland Police Bureau  
 Hollie Pihl, Washington County Circuit Court Judge  
 Karen Potter, Speedy Hi. Sales Ltd.  
 Stoney Quick, Operations Superintendent for Oregon, State Farm Insurance  
 Ed Schafer, Director, Center for Population Research, Portland State University  
 Michael D. Schrunk, Multnomah County District Attorney  
 Mildred Schwab, former City Commissioner  
 Carolyn Sheldon, Student Services, Portland Public Schools  
 Mike Sherman, Portland Police Bureau  
 Helen Smith, Multnomah County Senior District Attorney  
 Dick Springer, State Representative and Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee  
 Ron Still, former Police Chief  
 Robert Tobin, former acting Police Chief  
 Charles Tracy, Professor of Administration of Justice, Portland State University  
 Scott Upham, Washington County District Attorney  
 Jay Wan, Detective, Lake Oswego Police Department  
 David J. Williams, Detective, Planning and Research, Portland Police Bureau  
 William Wood, Corrections Division, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office  
 Eugene A. Yocom, Detective, Portland Police Bureau  
 Mary Young, Assistant to Clark County Prosecuting Attorney, Vancouver, Washington

Appendix B  
 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Pauline. "Proposal to Stretch Jail Space," Multnomah County, June 24, 1986.  
 Beck, Allen. Recidivism of Young Parolees, Bureau of Justice Services, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., May 1987.

- Beedle, Steve. Evaluation of the Home Security Program: A Three Year Follow-Up. Portland Police Bureau, Portland, Oregon, March, 1983.
- Bennet, David. Analysis of Defendent Processing, Multnomah County, Oregon, 1987.
- Blackburn, Ed and Gregory Gudger. "Proposal for Publically Funded Drug Detoxification," Office of Neighborhood Association, Portland, Oregon, January, 1987.
- Bradford, Shirley. "Burglary & Robbery, Portland, Oregon." Prepared for High Impact Task Force, Law Enforcement Council, State of Oregon, 1972.
- Breed, Allen. "The State of Corrections Today: Triumph of Pluralistic Ignorance." Transcription of speech. Edna McConnel Clark Foundation, New York, New York, February, 1987.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, Household Burglary, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., January 1985.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, Households Touched by Crime, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- Center for Population Research and Census. "Population Projections, Oregon and Its Counties 1980-2000." Portland State University.
- City Club of Portland Bulletin:  
 "Adult Prostitution," August 20, 1984.  
 "Constitutional Amendment: \$96 Million Bonds for State-County Prison Buildings," May 2, 1986.  
 "Human Services Policy in Oregon," January 30, 1987.  
 "State Measure #10: Revises Many Criminal Laws Concerning Victims Rights, Evidence, Sentencing, Parole," October 17, 1986.
- City-County Public Safety Commission, "Draft for Public Comment: Proposed Public Safety Policies," Portland, Oregon, February, 1985.
- Clark, Barbara. Review of Bureau of Police: Patrol Staffing and Deployment Practices, Office of the City Auditor, Portland, Oregon, April, 1987.
- Code of the City of Portland. "Precious Metal and Gem Dealers and Second Hand Dealers," Chapter 14.37.
- Cover, Marilyn. "Oregon Law Related Education Project." Criminal Justice Institute, Inc., The Corrections Yearbook, South Salem, New York, 1985.
- Daley, Dennis. "Report on Portland Burglary," Portland Police Bureau, 1984.
- "ESD Developments," Volume 14, No. 2, Winter 1986.
- Feeley, Malcom and Lloyd Ohlin. Challenge for the States: Criminal Justice and Corrections. National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 1982.
- Feeney, Anne Kelley. Internal Audit: Jail Administration-Information Systems, Department of Justice Services, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, September, 1986.
- Lashley, John and Carolyn Sheldon. "Project Return -- Year-End Report," June 1986.

- "Law in a Free Society", Center for Civic Education, established and affiliated with the State Bar of California.
- "Law Related Education Classroom Process and Impact Findings," Phase II, Year I Evaluation, funded by JJJDP Grant #79-AX-0036.
- Memorandum from Burglary Task Force, Portland Police Bureau to Penny Harrington, Chief of Police. June 28, 1985.
- Memorandum from Cynthia Butts, Program Staff Assistant, Multnomah County Juvenile Court to Harold Ogburn, Director, Multnomah County Juvenile Court, November 25, 1986.
- Methvin, Eugene H. "The Proven Key to Crime Control," Readers Digest, May, 1987.
- Multnomah County Corrections, "Proposal for Increasing Correction Program," fiscal year 1986-87.
- National Institute of Justice, Drug Use Forecasting, 1987, (draft).
- "Neighborhood Watch," Neighborhoods Against Crime, Portland, Oregon, 1983.
- Office of the Mayor, "Portland Safer City Plan: A Plan for City Action," City of Portland, January, 1988.
- Oregon Burglary and Fire Alarm Association. "The Symbol of the Professional."
- "Oregon Uniform Crime Report - 100," Actual Offenses, December 1986 and 1987, P & R 87-10, Portland Police Bureau, February 4, 1987.
- Orr, Lieutenant Allan, Sergeant Dennis Chaney, and Sergeant Larry Cochever. Jail Space Task Force, Final Report, January 10, 1986.
- "Overcrowded Time: Why Prisons are So Crowded and What Can Be Done." Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, New York.
- Portland Police Bureau Annual Reports, Portland, Oregon, 1976-1986.
- Portland Police Bureau. "Comparison of Urban Rate of Burglary," (Project CURB).
- Portland Police Bureau, "Evaluation of the Home Security Program," 1983.
- Regional Criminal Justice Council. "Annual Report to the Supreme Court and the Governor," Portland, Oregon, January, 1987.
- Rosenbaum, Janet. Burglary Statistics, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Rockville, Maryland, 1985.
- Schneider, Anne. "Victimization Surveys and Criminal Justice System Evaluation," Sample Surveys of the Victims of Crime, Cambridge: Ballinger, 1976.
- Silberman, Charles F., Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice, 1st Edition, Random House, 1978.
- State Farm Fire and Casualty Company. "The Adventures of Surelocked Homes," Bloomington, Illinois.

*Linda Peters*, evaluation specialist, Portland Public Schools, will continue as chair of Land Use & Transportation. LU & T studied Portland and regional transportation issues this past year and invited several speakers to address the committee on these and other topics, such as solid waste disposal. With B & L, LU & T sponsored a very successful Open Forum on land use economic development Planning. LU & T will continue to watch-dog development in Portland, such as the I-5 Eastbank Freeway move proposals, as well as longer range issues in land use.

*Tamara Kelley*, Regional Sales Manager, ITT/American Network, continues as chair of Law & Public Safety. This last year, L & PS organized several Open Forums, including ones on youth gangs and civilian oversight of police. L & PS members have helped draft a research charge on racial justice in Portland. The committee is working with the Education committee on an implementation plan for the Club's report on juvenile services. The committee will continue to study youth gangs, as well as problems of drugs, alcohol, and meth labs.

*Dennis Cusack*, architect, will chair Science & High Tech for another year. S & HT has been most active in its sponsorship of the Science Breakfast series. Science Breakfasts have covered such varied topics as robots, science literacy, and earthquakes in the N.W. Coming breakfasts include speakers on computer parallel processing and the science of chaos.

The 1988-89 Standing Committee Chairs will soon contact their newly re-constituted committees in preparation for their first meetings in September. Last year, Standing Committees held 35 Open Forums and proposed many successful Friday programs and research charges. We look forward to another exciting year of contributions from Standing Committees, the "eyes and ears" of the City Club.

**Study Committee Tours State Penitentiary**

The committee studying Ballot Measure #4, the initiative to keep certain repeat felony offenders in prison without parole, was given a tour of the Oregon State Penitentiary in Salem on August 17th. Corrections Counselor *Robert Brunsman* conducted the tour through a cell block and several other areas in the prison. The Committee had an opportunity to see firsthand conditions in the OSP as well ask questions to give them a better understanding of the background and status of the current system. *Tamara Felt* of Office Services was also very helpful in answering the committee's questions about the prison and staff there.

Ballot Measure reports will be published and voted upon by the membership in October.

**New Member Welcome!**

*Kernan Bagley*, United States Marshall, United States Marshalls' Service.

*Robert Bothman*, Director, Department of Transportation.

*Jackson Burgess*, Corporate Officer, Jackson Burgess Limited.

*Thomas Jovick*, Vice-President, Internal Operations, PACC Health Plans.

*Michael Kennedy*, Regional Manager, CH2M Hil Northwest, Inc.

*Leslie Prentice*, Project Coordinator, Portland Development Commission.

*James Schell*, Assistant Superintendent, Lake Oswego School District 7J.

*David Schlactus*, Executive Director, Anaesthesiologists Associated Inc.

*Linda Wright*, Assistant Vice President, U.S. Bancorp.

NEWSPAPER SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT PORTLAND, OREGON



**COSGRAVE & KESTER  
RECEIVED**

**AUG 29 1988**

NOTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ SPINDLE \_\_\_\_\_

FILED BY \_\_\_\_\_