

North Park Needle Exchange Program Survey: Final Report

**Susan E. Baer, Ph.D. and C. Richard Hofstetter, Ph.D.
San Diego State University**

July 16, 2004

This report was prepared for Family Health Centers of San Diego.

North Park Needle Exchange Program Survey: Final Report
Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Final Report 6

I. Level and Nature of Citizen Support for Needle Exchange Programs 6

II. Level and Nature of Citizen Participation in Planning and Implementing the North Park Needle Exchange Program..... 12

III. Perceived Impact of the North Park Needle Exchange Program on the North Park Neighborhood 19

IV. Additional Citizen Beliefs about the North Park Needle Exchange Program 21

V. Suggestions..... 24

VI. Survey Methodology..... 25

APPENDIX A: North Park Needle Exchange Program Survey Questionnaire 33

APPENDIX B: Crosstabulations 52

North Park Needle Exchange Program Survey: Final Report

Executive Summary

Susan E. Baer, Ph.D. and C. Richard Hofstetter, Ph.D.

San Diego State University

July 16, 2004

This report describes findings from a telephone survey of 400 randomly selected North Park residents regarding their views of needle exchange programs in general and the needle exchange program currently operating in North Park. Although the program operating in North Park is officially referred to as a “syringe” exchange program, the program is referred to as a “needle” exchange program throughout the survey questionnaire for ease of respondent comprehension. As a result, this report also uses the term “needle” exchange program.

- **Level and Nature of Citizen Support for Needle Exchange Programs**

- North Park Citizens’ Level of Support for Needle Exchange Programs in General

A solid majority of survey respondents (71.4%) approve or approve strongly of needle exchange programs “in general” without specifying the North Park needle exchange program in particular. About 23.4% of survey respondents disapprove or disapprove strongly of needle exchange programs “in general”. Only 5.1% of respondents expressed no opinion.

- North Park Citizens’ Perceptions about Needle Exchange Programs in General

North Park citizens hold diverse views regarding the consequences of needle exchange programs for a community “in general”. Of note is that over 75% of survey respondents agree or agree strongly that needle exchange programs “reduce public health care costs ... for HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C” and “reduce the spread of communicable diseases in the community”. Also, over 60% of survey participants disagree or disagree strongly that needle exchange programs “increase conflict” in the community.

- Injection Drug Users in North Park

About 75% of survey participants believe that there are “some” or more injection drug users in North Park. North Park citizens did not report injection drug use as the most salient issue in their lives, but the majority of participants in North Park reported that injection drug use in their community is an important issue.

- North Park Citizens' Level of Support for the North Park Needle Exchange Program

A majority of North Park survey participants also support the needle exchange program in North Park. Specifically, about 59.5% of survey participants said they approve or approve strongly, 18.6% said they disapprove or disapprove strongly, and 21.9% said they have no opinion about the North Park needle exchange program.

- Program's Influence on Individuals

Approximately 75% of survey participants reported that having a needle exchange program in North Park would have no effect at all on the way they live or "not much" effect on their lives.

- Changing Views about the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Of those who reported that they had heard something about the North Park needle exchange program, 84.7% said their views about the program have not changed since February 2003, the start of the program.

- Conditions of Citizen Support for the North Park Needle Exchange Program

While approximately 59.5% of survey participants reported that they support the needle exchange program in North Park, a much larger percentage, over 80% of those expressing an opinion, said that they would support a needle exchange program in North Park if the program was located in a medical building or in a permanent building rather than a van.

The majority of North Park residents do not want the needle exchange program to be located in very close proximity to their home. Approximately 71.0% of survey participants did not want the needle exchange program located "next door or across the street" from their home.

- **Level and Nature of Citizen Participation in Planning and Implementing the North Park Needle Exchange Program**

- Civic Resources in North Park

Over 70% of survey participants are interested or very interested in political and social issues in North Park.

- Sources of Information about North Park Community Events

North Park citizens use a variety of communication media to “learn of community events”. Most often, however, survey participants reported learning about community events from community meetings (61.3% very often and 26.8% often).

- Most Important Problem in North Park

Crime, cost of living, housing concerns, and crowding were most frequently mentioned as the most important problem facing people in North Park.

- North Park Citizens’ Level of Trust in Officials

A layer of cynicism and distrust toward elected officials characterizes a large proportion of North Park survey participants. About 54.0% of survey respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly that “politicians do what is in the best interest of the public”.

In contrast, approximately 58.5% of survey participants agreed or agreed strongly that they could “trust officials who are running the needle exchange program to do what is right”.

- North Park Citizens’ Information about the North Park Needle Exchange Program

The level of information about the North Park needle exchange program is very low. The major source of information among those who had heard anything about the needle exchange program was posters.

- North Park Citizens' Participation in the Development of the North Park Needle Exchange Program

The survey results show the level of citizen participation in helping to develop the needle exchange program to be extremely low. Only one person (out of 400 possible) said that he/she had been involved in planning or implementing the program. The primary reason given for noninvolvement was that citizens "did not know about the program" (58.8%) versus other possible responses such as "did not care/not interested" or "too busy/no time".

- **Perceived Impact of the North Park Needle Exchange Program on the North Park Neighborhood**

- Perceived Effects of the North Park Needle Exchange Program

A large percentage of survey participants (79.0%) believe that the North Park needle exchange program has had "no effect" on their personal lives. Fewer respondents believe that the program has had "no effect" on the community of North Park itself (29.9%) and on the image of North Park (40.0%).

- Perceived Consequences of the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Large numbers of survey participants believed both negative and positive consequences would follow from a needle exchange program in North Park. Consult Table 5 in this report for a detailed account of the results.

- **Additional Citizen Beliefs about the North Park Needle Exchange Program**

Survey participants were asked about their beliefs regarding a number of other issues related to the North Park needle exchange program. Consult Table 6 in this report for a detailed account of the results.

- **Suggestions**

- Consider locating the North Park needle exchange program in a building (medical or other) rather than a van in order to increase citizen support for the program. If the needle exchange program is expanded in San Diego, officials might locate the program within a particular neighborhood in a building, van, or offer a mixed approach that combines the use of a building and a van depending upon the preferences of both program clients and residents in each particular neighborhood.

- Develop additional mechanisms for North Park residents to be involved and to provide input about the North Park needle exchange program in order to strengthen both citizen trust in the program and citizen trust in elected officials. Options might include holding additional public meetings/forums about the needle exchange program, reaching out to those with milder opinions about the program and to more conservative residents, enhancing civic education and public awareness about the program and its potential benefits (including increasing public awareness of Hepatitis C), and discussing resident concerns about the program that the attached survey data highlight, among others.
 - If the needle exchange program is expanded to other neighborhoods in San Diego, increase and broaden the amount and nature of resident participation and input during the program's planning and implementation.
- **Survey Methodology**

Although reference to San Diego's North Park neighborhood is used throughout this report, a random digit dial sample of 400 adults residing in U.S. Census tract 92104 was used at the request of Mr. Robert Lewis of Family Health Centers of San Diego, the survey's sponsor. More detailed information on survey methodology is contained in the "Survey Methodology" section of this report.

North Park Needle Exchange Program Survey: Final Report

**Susan E. Baer, Ph.D. and C. Richard Hofstetter, Ph.D.
San Diego State University**

July 16, 2004

I. Level and Nature of Citizen Support for Needle Exchange Programs

North Park Citizens' Level of Support for Needle Exchange Programs in General

Solid Approval:

A series of questions concerning needle exchange programs was introduced by first asking in very general terms about needle exchange programs without linking the program explicitly to North Park. Differences between responses to these questions and subsequent questions that ask about the North Park needle exchange program specifically were assumed to indicate how responses change when the program is located in one's own neighborhood. The complete questionnaire is found in Appendix A of this report.

A solid majority of survey respondents (71.4%) support needle exchange programs "in general" with only 23.4% of respondents opposing them. Specifically, about 39.8% of respondents in the survey approve of needle exchange programs strongly and 31.6% approve. In addition, 12.9% disapprove and 10.5% disapprove strongly of needle exchange programs "in general". Only 5.1% expressed "no opinion" about the programs.

North Park Citizens' Perceptions about Needle Exchange Programs in General

Consequences of Needle Exchange Programs for a Community:

As Table 1 indicates, great diversity exists about what North Park citizens believe are the consequences of needle exchange programs for a community "in general". This question did not ask about perceptions of the North Park program specifically.

Noteworthy is that over 75% of survey participants agree or agree strongly that needle exchange programs "reduce public health care costs...for HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C" and "reduce the spread of communicable diseases in the community." In addition, over 60.0% disagree or disagree strongly that needle exchange programs "increase conflict" in the community. A majority of survey respondents (55.4%) agree or agree strongly that needle exchange programs "improve the quality of life in a community". Slightly more survey participants (53.0%) disagree that needle exchange programs "attract homeless people to the community" than agree (47.0%). Responses regarding a needle exchange program's effect on property values were split almost evenly with 50.6% of respondents agreeing or agreeing strongly that needle exchange programs "lower property values in a community" and 49.4% disagreeing or disagreeing strongly.

Two questions asked respondents explicitly about their perceptions of a needle exchange program's effect on crime in the community. A majority (64.0%) disagree or disagree strongly that needle exchange programs "decrease crime in the community". Also, 52.1% of respondents agree or agree strongly that needle exchange programs "attract drug dealers to the community" while 47.9% disagree or disagree strongly.

Table 1
Q14. “Following are some perceptions people have reported about the consequences of needle exchange programs for a community.... Needle exchange programs generally...”^a

<u>Response</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>(N)</u>
1.improve the quality of life in a community...	12.2%	43.2	30.2	14.4	(361)
2.attract drug dealers to the community.....	12.3%	39.8	31.7	16.2	(357)
3.lower property values in the community.....	12.5%	38.1	35.2	14.2	(352)
4.reduce public health care costs for treating people with HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C.....	30.7%	46.5	16.0	6.8	(368)
5.reduce the spread of communicable diseases in the community.....	33.7%	47.3	12.8	6.3	(383)
6.decrease crime in the community.....	8.2%	27.8	48.2	15.8	(342)
7.increase conflict in the community.....	6.7%	30.6	43.5	19.1	(372)
8.attract homeless people to the community...	8.9%	38.1	36.8	16.2	(370)

^a Numbers in cells are percentages responding. The number of responses is presented in parentheses.

Injection Drug Users in North Park

At the most general level, a large portion of North Park respondents has concern about the illicit use of narcotics in North Park. About 17.8% said that they have heard “a great deal” about injection drug use in the area, and 32.8% said they have heard “some” about injection drug use.

Three out of four citizens believes that there are “some” or more injection drug users in North Park. About 45.7% said there are “some” injection drug users in the community, 22.6% said there are “quite a few”, and 6.4% said there are “a large number of injection drug users” in the community.

Only one in three survey participants reported that injection drug users do not affect their lives at all. Another 22.8% reported that injection drug users have little effect on their lives. However, a sizeable group of participants, 43.2% reported that injection drug users have some or a great deal of effect on their lives.

Although injection drug use is not reported as the most salient issue in North Park citizens' lives, the majority of participants in North Park reported that injection drug use in their community is an important issue. More than one survey participant in four (25.9%) believes that injection drug users in the community serve as a "very important issue in North Park." An additional 44.2% believes that it is "an important issue."

On the other hand, the majority of citizens do not feel very empowered to do anything about injection drug users themselves. About 32.9% reported that they could have "no effect at all" in influencing the problem, 26.3% reported "not much" influence, and 33.7% reported that they could have "some" influence on the problem in North Park. Only 7.1% reported they could have "a great deal" of influence over the problem in their community.

North Park Citizens' Level of Support for the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Majority Approval:

When asked explicitly about their feelings concerning the needle exchange program in North Park, a majority of respondents (59.5%) support the program, 18.6% oppose the program, and 21.9% said they have no opinion about the North Park needle exchange program. More specifically, 21.7% of respondents strongly approve of the program, 37.8% approve of the program, 9.2% disapprove of the program, and 9.4% strongly disapprove of the program. The level of support for a program in participants' own community is lower than their level of support for needle exchange programs "in general" as might be explained by existing literature on local opposition to controversial land use decisions of various sorts by residents in that particular community. In addition, mild opinion and no opinion are quite changeable in either direction depending upon external events and mobilization. Although citizens provided a

range of reasons for approval/disapproval of the needle exchange program in North Park, the reasons reflect those provided in Table 1.

Program's Influence on Individuals:

Nearly six in ten (59.8%) participants reported that having a needle exchange program in North Park would have no effect at all on the way they live, and an additional 15.3% reported that it would have “not much” effect on their lives. But a significant minority, 24.9%, reported that a needle exchange program would have “some” or “a great deal” of influence on them and the way they live their lives.

Changing Views about the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Among those who reported that they had heard something about the North Park needle exchange program, 84.7% said their views about the program have not changed since February 2003, the start of the program. Another 15.3% said change had occurred in the way that they evaluated the program. Among the latter group, 48.1% said their views of the program are now more positive, and 44.4% said their views of the program are now more negative than before the program started. The remaining 7.4% said they have become more neutral.

Conditions of Citizen Support for the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Table 2 illustrates that citizen support for the needle exchange program in North Park varied by location of the program. Survey participants did not want the needle exchange program located “across the street” from their home (71.0%) or “on the block” where their home is (59.5%). Many expressed support for a needle exchange program if it was located far from their own home (77.9%) or “outside the North Park community” (77.0%). Again,

literature on local opposition to controversial land use decisions might best explain these findings.

Over 80% of those expressing an opinion said that they would support a needle exchange program in North Park if it was located in a medical building (84.8%), in a permanent building rather than in a van (81.1%), in an area away from schools (84.6%), or in an area away from homes (83.3%). These findings suggest that elected officials and program administrators consider locating the needle exchange program in a building in North Park rather than a mobile van in order to increase public support for the program.

If the needle exchange program is expanded in San Diego, officials might locate the program within a particular neighborhood in a building, van, or offer a mixed approach that combines the use of a building and a van depending upon the preferences of the neighborhood. In other words, for each neighborhood that offers needle exchange program services, the needs and desires of both the clients utilizing program services there and the general citizenry in the neighborhood might determine the best approach for that particular neighborhood. This allows services to be tailored to each neighborhood rather than requiring a “one-size-fits-all” approach. If citizen preferences are realized in this way, one expects that their support for the program will also increase.

Table 2
Q33. “Some people have told us that they might support a needle exchange program in their neighborhood under some conditions but not under other conditions. Would you support a needle exchange program in North Park if the program were...”^a

<u>Location</u>	Percent	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>(N)</u>
1. Located in a medical building.	84.8%	(387)
2. Located in a permanent building rather than a van.	81.1%	(371)
3. Located in an area away from schools.	84.6%	(377)
4. Located in an area away from homes.	83.3%	(371)
5. Located on the block where your home is.	40.5%	(375)
6. Located far from your home.	77.9%	(358)
7. Located next door or across the street from your home.	29.0%	(376)
8. Located outside of the North Park community.	77.0%	(348)

^a Numbers in cells are percentages of survey participants who said they might support a needle exchange program given the specific location mentioned. Percentages are based on the total sample N's in parentheses.

II. Level and Nature of Citizen Participation in Planning and Implementing the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Civic Resources in North Park

Interest in Issues among North Park Citizens:

Citizen involvement and participation is perhaps the major resource in any community, and survey respondents are interested in the political and social issues affecting their neighborhood. Over 70% of respondents are interested or very interested in these issues. Specifically, about 49.2 percent of residents said they are “interested”, and another 24.1 percent said they are “very interested” in “political and social issues in North Park.”

Sources of Information about North Park Community Events:

This section focuses on where citizens learn about North Park community events in general and is not specific to events related to the needle exchange program. North Park residents use a variety of communication media to “learn of community events” as Table 3

shows. Most often, respondents reported learning about community events from community meetings (61.3% very often) and family members (55.0% very often). They reported learning of community events “very often” from people at work or school (45.9%), and politicians and public officials (41.8%). Friends or neighbors are not a major source of information for most people in North Park (19.0% very often).

In addition, citizens are less likely to use mass media to learn about events in North Park. Major mass media such as newspapers rarely focus on community events specific to individual neighborhoods, so we assume exposure is limited to other sources. Only 14.5% of participants said they learn about community events “very often” from newspapers, 24.4% percent from posters, 33.3% from radio, and 28.5% from television. However, the circulation of community newsletters in the area must be low and/or community events must receive little coverage in them, because only 20.0% of respondents reported learning about community events “very often” from community newsletters.

Table 3
Q3. “So far as North Park is concerned, would you say that you learn of community events from...”^a

<u>Response</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>(N)</u>
1. community meetings.....	61.3%	26.8	8.3	3.5	(399)
2. newspapers.....	14.5%	23.6	40.9	21.1	(399)
3. community newsletters	20.0%	28.5	36.0	15.5	(400)
4. posters	24.4%	34.9	32.9	7.8	(398)
5. radio	33.3%	36.8	22.6	7.3	(399)
6. TV	28.5%	37.8	23.0	10.8	(400)
7. family members	55.0%	20.4	20.1	4.5	(398)
8. friends or neighbors	19.0%	30.8	36.3	13.8	(399)
9. people at work or school.....	45.9%	27.6	20.6	6.0	(399)
10. politicians and public officials.....	41.8%	39.0	14.4	4.8	(397)

^a Numbers in cells are percentages responding. The number of responses is presented in parentheses.

Most Important Problem in North Park:

North Park residents were asked what they saw as “the most important problem facing people in your neighborhood.” The question is “open-ended” in the sense that no responses are suggested so that participants in the survey formulate their own responses from whatever they are thinking. This item was expected to measure salience since the first response to this question is used to measure what people are most concerned about in their everyday lives.

The fact that most respondents (95.5%) indicated something other than needle exchange indicates that the needle exchange program is not the most salient issue in their lives. However, it may well be an issue, just not the most salient issue. Crime, cost of living, housing concerns, and crowding were the most frequently mentioned issues. In particular, many respondents indicated that they would like to see more police and more intense policing in North Park.

North Park Citizens’ Level of Trust in Officials:

Two questions were asked to assess the extent to which citizens felt that elected officials had their interests and the best interests of the community in mind when making policy. First, about 10.4% agreed strongly and 47.2% agreed somewhat that “politicians care what people like me think about policies that affect our lives.” More troubling was the 42.4% who disagreed with the question.

Second and more disturbing were the views expressed by 23.9% of participants who disagreed strongly and 30.1% who disagreed somewhat that “politicians do what is in the best interest of the public.” About 46.1% of participants agreed with the statement. A layer of cynicism and distrust characterizes a large proportion of North Park survey participants.

An additional question was asked to assess the extent to which citizens trust officials “running” the North Park needle exchange program. The majority of survey participants, 58.5%, said that they agreed strongly or agreed that they could “trust officials who are running the needle exchange program to do what is right”. One in five, 20.1%, expressed no opinion, and another 21.5% disagreed strongly or disagreed with the statement.

Finally, a question was asked to assess the extent to which citizens believe that special interests “have”, and by implication “have been given”, too much influence over the needle exchange program. About one survey participant in three (33.0%) agreed strongly or agreed with the statement that special interests “have too much influence over the needle exchange program” while 13.5% disagreed. Over half, 53.4%, withheld judgment by claiming that they “had no opinion” on the issue.

North Park Citizens’ Information about the North Park Needle Exchange Program

The level of information about the North Park needle exchange program among survey participants is very low. About 53.3% said they had heard nothing about the program in North Park. Another 13.0% said they had heard “not much”, 23.5% “some,” and 10.3% “a great deal” about a needle exchange program in North Park.”

A brief information test was administered during the survey. Among those who reported that they had heard of the program, information levels were moderate to high. For instance, 71.4% of participants know the approximate location of the program (University and 31st), 83.3% know the program uses a mobile van, 61.5% know the program offers other services besides needle exchange (although very few could recall specific services). However, the knowledgeable group represents only about 10.0% of all residents in North Park.

Sources of Information:

As Table 4 indicates, those who had heard anything about the needle exchange program were most likely to have heard about it “often” or “very often” from posters (92.5%), family members (89.7%), radio (88.7%), community meetings (87.1%), television (84.3%), and people at work or at school (82.8%). Fewer survey participants reported hearing often or very often from newspapers (65.6%), community newsletters (65.1%), and friends or neighbors (67.3%).

Table 4
Q15a. “ [IF HEARD ANYTHING Q15:] To what extent did you hear about a needle exchange program in North Park from each of the following sources? Would you say that you heard about a North Park needle exchange program from...?”^a

<u>Response</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>(N)</u>
1. community meetings.....	65.6%	21.5	9.7	3.2	(186)
2. newspapers.....	30.1%	35.5	22.6	11.8	(186)
3. community newsletters.....	35.5%	29.6	26.3	8.6	(186)
4. posters.....	71.5%	21.0	7.0	0.5	(186)
5. radio.....	64.5%	24.2	10.2	1.1	(186)
6. TV.....	45.9%	38.4	12.4	3.2	(185)
7. family members.....	73.9%	15.8	4.9	5.4	(184)
8. friends or neighbors.....	42.2%	25.1	21.9	10.7	(187)
9. people at work or school.....	67.2%	15.6	11.8	5.4	(186)
10. politicians and public officials.....	41.9%	37.1	14.0	7.0	(186)

^a Numbers in cells are percentages responding. The number of responses is presented in parentheses.

North Park Citizens’ Participation in the Development of the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Noninvolvement:

The very low level of citizen information regarding the needle exchange program in North Park might explain extremely low levels of citizen participation in planning and implementing the program. Nearly no one who participated in the survey reported having been

involved in the planning or implementation of the North Park needle exchange program. One person (out of 400 possible!) said that he/she had been involved in each activity.

The primary reason given for noninvolvement was that citizens “did not know about the program” (58.8%). About 11.0% reported lack of caring or interest as the reason they were not involved, 10.0% that they were too busy or did not have time, and 16.0% gave a diverse variety of specific reasons. The remainder expressed no reason. This suggests that a majority of respondents may have liked to help plan and provide input about the needle exchange program had they known about it.

Lack of citizen participation in the process appears also when respondents were asked if they had “spoken about this program with anyone else who was involved in the planning or implementation stages”. About 0.8% said they had discussed planning, 1.0% implementation, and 3.0% said they had discussed both.

In addition, only 13 people (3.3% of respondents) reported having attended any community meetings concerning the needle exchange program in North Park. Of the 13, however, eleven believed that the meetings provided “meaningful discussion of the issues among members of the community”, and only two did not.

There is also a widespread perception among respondents that officials failed to solicit citizen opinion about the needle exchange program in North Park. Only 16.3% of respondents reported that officials had “asked the public about their views of the North Park needle exchange program”.

Although the survey data shows that North Park respondents are interested in political and social issues affecting their neighborhood, they are poorly informed about the needle exchange program operating there and were almost completely uninvolved in helping to

develop the program. Despite their noninvolvement in helping to plan and implement the North Park program, respondents were split when asked, “To what extent do you think that you yourself can influence whether or not a permanent needle exchange program is located in North Park?” About 51.2% responded “not at all” or “not much,” while 39.5% responded “some” and 9.2% “a great deal.” Thus, participants still feel a moderate amount of self efficacy regarding the future direction of the needle exchange program in their neighborhood. Self efficacy occurs when a person feels empowered to do something about an issue and that a chance exists for personally desirable goals to follow. High self efficacy increases political behaviors including support or opposition for public policy.

If program administrators and elected officials would like to increase citizen support for the needle exchange program in North Park, we suggest that they develop innovative ways to involve additional numbers of program supporters, opponents, and those currently undecided in a process of discussion and planning for the program. Attempts to involve those with mild opinions either in support or in opposition to the program and those undecided might receive particular emphasis, because these opinions are most malleable.

Residents in the North Park area are routinely exposed to a number of mass and interpersonal media that officials could use to contact them concerning the needle exchange program. The average survey participant watched TV news programs 4.5 days a week (SD=2.54), read a local newspaper 3.2 times a week (SD=2.77), listened to local radio news 3.7 times per week (SD=2.87), and spoke with others about local news 3.6 times per week (SD=2.28). Also, the average survey participant read a North Park community newsletter 3.5 times (SD=5.7) in the last six months and attended community meetings 0.5 times in the last six months.

III. Perceived Impact of the North Park Needle Exchange Program on the North Park Neighborhood

Perceived Effects of the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Effect on Personal Lives:

Large percentages of persons in North Park believe the needle exchange program has had little or no effect on their personal lives. No direct connection was made between the program and one's personal space for many. About 79.0% said the program has had "no effect" on their personal lives, while 3.7% said it has had a very negative effect, 5.8% a somewhat negative effect, 8.9% a somewhat positive effect, and 2.6% a very positive effect on their lives.

Effect on Community:

Fewer respondents, 29.9%, expressed the view that the program has had "no effect" on the community of North Park itself. Positive perceptions outweighed negative perceptions. About 11.5% of respondents said the program has had a very positive effect, 36.2% a somewhat positive effect, 14.8% a somewhat negative effect, and 7.6% a very negative effect.

Effect on Image of North Park:

Opinion about the impact of the program on the image of North Park was somewhat more balanced. About 40.0% said the program has had "no effect" on the image of North Park. About 8.0% said the program has had a very negative effect, 22.3% a somewhat negative effect, 22.9% a somewhat positive effect, and 6.9% a very positive effect on the image of North Park.

Perceived Consequences of the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Large numbers of survey participants thought that both negative and positive specific consequences would follow from a needle exchange program in North Park, although negative perceptions appear to outweigh positive ones. Overall, however, it appears that citizens hold a fairly differentiated view of what the program means for their community.

As Table 5 illustrates, approximately 60% believed that the program was likely or very likely to increase the number of needles left on the street and threaten the safety of children in the community. Nearly 60% believed that an increase in crime was a likely or very likely consequence of the program.

Opinion is likely highly malleable on concerns since about 60% believed that the program would decrease the problem of injection drug use in the community and also believed that the program would increase injection drug addiction in the community.

A majority of survey respondents (60.0%) believed that the needle exchange program is not very likely or not at all likely to “bring the community together to deal realistically with a social problem”. Larger percentages of survey participants believed that the needle exchange program is not very likely or not at all likely to lead injection drug users to seek drug addiction treatment or to lead them to seek HIV/AIDS testing and treatment.

Approximately 80% of participants thought it not very likely or not at all likely for the needle exchange program to reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS or reduce the spread of Hepatitis C infection in the community. This finding is peculiar, given that over 80% of respondents believed that needle exchange programs “in general” reduce the spread of communicable diseases in a community. We suggest that elected officials and program administrators increase civic education and public awareness efforts in the North Park community, so that

residents are better informed about the public health benefits that a needle exchange program may create for their neighborhood. In addition, we suggest civic education efforts to counter additional negative perceptions that do not hold true in reality. In Section II, we listed media forms that might serve as conduits for such efforts.

Table 5

Q27. “Following are some things people have mentioned that may be consequences of needle exchange programs in local communities. So far as you know, would a needle exchange program in North Park be very likely, likely, not very likely or not at all likely to:”^a

<u>Item</u>	<u>Very Likely</u>	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Not Very Likely</u>	<u>Not At All Likely</u>	<u>(N)</u>
1. Increase the number of needles left on the streets of the community.	19.2%	43.2	17.3	20.3	(375)
2. Decrease the problem of injection drug use in the community.	19.4%	41.0	27.1	12.5	(376)
3. Threaten the safety of children in the community.	19.3%	40.5	22.0	18.2	(368)
4. Attract crime to the community.	11.8%	45.8	26.6	15.9	(365)
5. Bring the community together to deal realistically with a social problem	8.5%	31.5	40.5	19.5	(375)
6. Lead injection drug users who use the program to seek drug addiction treatment.	8.9%	24.4	40.8	25.8	(360)
7. Lead injection drug users who use the program to seek HIV/AIDS testing and treatment.	6.9%	19.1	44.9	29.1	(361)
8. Increase injection drug addiction in the community.	22.5%	44.4	17.8	15.3	(365)
9. Reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS in the community.	5.0%	14.2	37.4	43.4	(380)
10. Reduce the spread of Hepatitis C infection in the community.	4.5%	14.2	34.0	47.2	(379)

^a Numbers in cells are percentages with each type of perception and numbers of persons responding to the item. N's do not equal 400, because some survey participants did not respond to the item.

IV. Additional Citizen Beliefs about the North Park Needle Exchange Program

Survey participants were asked about their beliefs regarding a number of other issues related to the North Park needle exchange program as Table 6 indicates. A solid majority of participants (80.5%) believed that most persons in North Park “know little” about the program. These beliefs are most likely based on self-assessments of knowledge.

Participants tended to believe (55.3%) that people in the area “can have some influence over how the needle exchange program is run” and that “needles distributed by the program are monitored” (42.3%). In addition, 39.3% of respondents reported the view that “the city put the needle exchange program in North Park because wealthier neighborhoods did not want it”. However, 33.8% of participants said that the city located the program in North Park “because that is where officials think injection drug users are”. Also, only about one third of respondents (32.5%) believed that “most citizens in North Park were not interested in providing input about plans” for the program.

Table 6

Q28. “People have told us different things regarding the needle exchange program in North Park. From what you know or have heard, please tell me if each of the following statements is true or false, or if you don't know.”^a

<u>Statement</u>	<u>True</u>
1. The city put the needle exchange program in North Park because that is where officials think injection drug users are.	33.8%
2. Parents in North Park have become afraid to allow their children to play outside.	25.3%
3. Officials have not listened to citizens in North Park concerning the needle exchange program.	20.3%
4. Most citizens in North Park were not interested in providing input about plans for the needle exchange program.	32.5%
5. The needle exchange program is an important reason that people do not want to live in North Park.	9.8%
6. The needles distributed by the program are monitored (by “monitored” we mean carefully supervised and controlled).	42.3%
7. The needle exchange program has provided immediate referrals to most clients for treatment of addiction.	27.0%
8. The city tried to notify all citizens of North Park about the program during its planning stages.	15.3%
9. North Park citizens can have some influence over how the needle exchange program is run.	55.3%
10. Residents had an opportunity to participate in the planning and implementation of the needle exchange program.	27.5%
11. I personally heard about a public forum where the needle exchange program was to be discussed.	15.8%
12. Most citizens in North Park know little about the needle exchange program that is operating here.	80.5%
13. Politicians gave funds to businesses in North Park so they would not oppose the needle exchange program.	6.3%
14. The city council has shown respect for the community’s views about the needle exchange program.	26.5%
15. The city put the needle exchange program in North Park because wealthier neighborhoods did not want it.	39.3%
16. The police respond adequately to injection drug use crime in North Park.	28.8%

^a Numbers in cells are percentages of survey participants who believe the statement to be true. Percentages are based on the total sample N=400, so that nonresponses are not confounded with active belief that statements are true.

V. Suggestions

- Consider locating the North Park needle exchange program in a building (medical or other) rather than a van in order to increase citizen support for the program. If the needle exchange program is expanded in San Diego, officials might locate the program within a particular neighborhood in a building, van, or offer a mixed approach that combines the use of a building and a van depending upon the preferences of both program clients and residents in each particular neighborhood.
- Develop additional mechanisms for North Park residents to be involved and to provide input about the North Park needle exchange program in order to strengthen both citizen trust in the program and citizen trust in elected officials. Options might include holding additional public meetings/forums about the needle exchange program, reaching out to those with milder opinions about the program and to more conservative residents, enhancing civic education and public awareness about the program and its potential benefits (including increasing public awareness of Hepatitis C), and discussing resident concerns about the program that the attached survey data highlight, among others.
- If the needle exchange program is expanded to other neighborhoods in San Diego, increase and broaden the amount and nature of resident participation and input during the program's planning and implementation.

VI. Survey Methodology

The survey was conducted March 4, 2004 - April 17, 2004. Although reference to San Diego's North Park neighborhood is used in this report, a random digit dial sample of 400 adults residing in U.S. Census tract 92104 was used at the request of Mr. Robert Lewis of Family Health Centers of San Diego, the survey's sponsor. However, the Greater North Park Community is not contained exclusively within this census tract. The sample was designed to represent all respondents reachable by residential telephone (excluding cell phones); it was stratified by gender. Interviewing was conducted by closely supervised professional interviewers in San Diego State University's Social Science Research Laboratory using CATI technology during hours from 10 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Mondays thru Fridays, 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and 1:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays.

The language of interviewing was English or Spanish depending on the preference of survey participants. The completion rate was 66% of eligible respondents. Certain terms were used in the survey for ease of respondent comprehension. For example, although the program operating in North Park is officially referred to as a "syringe" exchange program, the program is referred to as a "needle" exchange program throughout the survey questionnaire. Selected characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Characteristics of the Sample

Mean Age:		42.6	(SD=14.73)
Mean Education:		14.8	(SD=3.10)
Latino or Hispanic Descent:		27.1%	Yes
Race or ethnicity:	White/Caucasian	61.7%	(384)
	African-American	6.3	
	Hispanic	21.9	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1.8	
	Other	8.3	
Marital Status:	Married	28.8%	(396)
	Widowed	3.3	
	Divorced/Separated	14.9	
	Single	50.3	
	Cohabiting	2.8	
Partisanship:	Strong/Weak Republican	15.38%	(287)
	Leaning Republican	2.4	
	Independent	18.4	
	Leaning Democrat	9.4	
	Strong/Weak Democrat	54.5	
Ideology:	Strong Conservative	5.1%	(390)
	Conservative	12.3	
	Middle of the road	40.8	
	Liberal	22.8	
	Strong Liberal	19.0	
Religious Faith:	Protestant	21.3%	(394)
	Catholic	28.7	
	Jewish/Muslim/Buddhist	5.3	
	Other	19.8	
	None	24.9	
Attend Religious Services:	Once a week	23.4%	(393)
	Once a month	9.7	
	Several times a year	23.2	
	Once a year/less	9.7	
	Not at all	34.1	

(Table 7 Continued)

Family Income:	Under \$10,000	8.3%	(375)
	\$10,000-\$20,000	17.3	
	\$20,000-\$30,000	20.5	
	\$30,000-\$40,000	16.0	
	\$40,000-\$50,000	11.5	
	\$50,000-\$60,000	6.9	
	\$60,000-\$70,000	4.0	
	\$70,000 or more	15.5	
Language of Interview:	English	90.8%	(399)
	Spanish	9.3	
Gender:	Male	50%	(400)
	Female	50	

All surveys based on probability sampling are subject to measurable error, the likelihood that sample estimates depart from population characteristics. Error is a function of the percentage and sample size, and increases as sample size decreases and as percentages approach 50%. For a sample of N=400 and the stated range of sample percentages, we can be 95% certain that the true population parameter is within a range stated in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Accuracy of Survey: 95% Confidence Intervals for Sample (N=400)^a

<u>Sample Estimate</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
50.0%	45.1%	54.9%
45.0%	40.1%	49.9%
40.0%	35.2%	44.8%
35.0%	30.3%	39.7%
30.0%	25.5%	34.5%
25.0%	20.8%	29.2%
20.0%	16.1%	23.9%
15.0%	11.5%	18.5%
10.0%	7.1%	12.9%
05.0%	2.9%	7.1%

^a The table should be read as indicating, for instance, that when the sample result is 35% we can be 95% confident that the population percentage is between 30.3% and 39.7%.

Bivariate Analyses

The preceding text has emphasized simple marginal distributions that provide an overall characterization of the adult population in the sampled census tract. These data do not provide a notion of bivariate associations, of subgroups that provide support or opposition to the needle exchange program in North Park.

Most items in the survey were crosstabulated by a set of demographic and other selected characteristics. Tables are presented in Appendix B.

Multivariate Analyses

Key dependent (response) variables were regressed on a set of indicators designed to measure general views in relation to the needle exchange program. The results show how each independent variable (predictor) is uniquely related to the response variables after all other predictors are controlled statistically. Results are reported in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8
Regression of Attitudes about Needle Exchange Programs on Selected Predictors^a

<u>Predictor^b</u>	Q13. General Approval of needle exchange programs	Q17. Approval of North Park needle exchange program	Q24. North Park program has affected me positively	Q25. North Park program affects community positively	Q26. Program affects community image positively
Married	-.072	-.151	*-.120	*-.147	-.031
Gender	.004	.043	-.018	-.002	-.050
Proximity	-.132	*-.162	-.053	-.060	*-.134
Black	.104	.303	.058	.072	**-.356
Latino	*-.226	-.104	.051	.030	.105
Asian	.240	.255	.058	.070	.053
Age	-.000	-.003	-.000	-.003	.002
Education	.020	.008	.001	.009	-.014
Income	-.020	-.022	-.008	-.009	-.024
Used syringes	-.181	*-.250	-.092	*-.155	.043
Trust officials	.083	.068	.033	*.066	.046
Trust Program Information	***.183	***.187	** .071	** .119	** .121
	.033	-.024	-.027	**-.080	**-.088
Ideology (Lib)	***.316	***.226	.030	** .093	***.123
(Constant)	.967	1.542	2.242	1.983	1.619
	R=.47	R=.42	R=.26	R=.32	R=.26
	F _(14,353) = 7.03	F _(14,353) = 5.54	F _(14,353) =1.85	F _(14,353) =2.90	F _(14,353) =3.26
	P=.000	P=.000	P=.031	P=.000	P=.000

^a Numbers in cells are unstandardized regression coefficients. Regression statistics are reported immediately below each set of coefficients. Associated probabilities are denoted as: * = P<.05, ** = P<.01, *** = P<.001.

^b Married is coded (married=1, else=0); proximity is coded (0-6 blocks=1, 6+=0); Black, Latino, and Asian are dummy coded with Caucasian serving as the reference category; used syringes is 1 if any were used for any reason, 2 otherwise; trust officials refers to politicians (elected officials) in general; trust program refers to confidence in how North Park program is run; information is a summated index of correct responses; and ideology ranges from very conservative to very liberal. Refer to question numbers in questionnaire for exact wording of items.

Table 9
Regression of Views of North Park Needle Exchange Program on Selected Predictors^a

<u>Predictor^b</u>	Q33. More accepting location of program—in community	Q27. Mean of positive statements about program	Q21. Information Index	Q27. Good – bad consequences of program	Q28. Favorable –unfavorable views of program
Married	*-.166	-1.554	.108	-.141	*-.472
Gender	-.061	-.445	.130	-.057	-.200
Proximity	-.012	-1.562	-.117	-.151	-.164
Black	.073	1.561	-.010	.146	-.229
Latino	-.090	*-2.968	-.184	*-.289	-.120
Asian	-.273	-.696	-.171	.006	-.527
Age	*-.005	-.041	.000	-.003	-.007
Education	-.005	-.017	.001	-.005	-.021
Income	-.000	.013	*.054	.000	.045
Used syringes	*-.166	-1.240	-.050	-.113	.170
Trust officials	.024	*1.337	.012	** .159	***.547
Trust Program	** .108	**1.624	*.130	** .185	***.406
Information	-.004	.713075	***.716
Ideology (Lib)	** .149	***2.973	*.111	***.295	** .269
(Constant)	1.508	38.836	-.538	-1.273	-2.258
	R=.35	R=.43	R=.26	R= .43	R=.47
	F _(14,353) = 3.45	F _(14,353) = 5.83	F _(14,353) =1.85	F _(14,353) = 5.79	F _(14,353) = 7.01
	P=.000	P=.000	P=.031	P=.000	P=.000

^a Numbers in cells are unstandardized regression coefficients. Regression statistics are reported immediately below each set of coefficients. Associated probabilities are denoted as: * = P<.05, ** = P<.01, *** = P<.001.

^b Married is coded (married=1, else=0); proximity is coded (0-6 blocks=1, 6+=0); Black, Latino, and Asian are dummy coded with Caucasian serving as the reference category; used syringes is 1 if any were used for any reason, 2 otherwise; trust officials refers to politicians (elected officials) in general; trust program refers to confidence in how North Park program is run; information is a summated index of correct responses; and ideology ranges from very conservative to very liberal. Refer to question numbers in questionnaire for exact wording of items.

Greater trust in the operation of the needle exchange program and more liberal ideological identification were consistently (with one exception) and powerfully related to approval of the needle exchange program after all other variables have been controlled. The associations were statistically significant even after controlling for other predictors, i.e., marital status, gender, race/ethnicity, education, income, reports of having used syringes for any reason, trust in elected officials, and level of information. One might conclude that those wishing to increase support for the program might attempt to reach out to more conservative

constituents, and to enhance trust in the operation of the program by increasing information about how it operates, possibly by increasing citizen involvement in it.

After controlling for all other predictors in the regression, those more trusting in elected officials were also more likely to report that the program affects North Park positively, express more positive views about the program, state that the program has more desirable consequences, and hold more favorable views of the needle exchange program. One might conclude that those wanting to bolster support for the program might attempt to enhance citizen trust in elected officials, possibly by expanding ways for citizens to be involved and provide input about the program.

In addition, residents who reported using syringes for any reason were less accepting of the program's location in the community, less likely to approve of the program, and to believe that the program negatively affects the community. Older people and those of Latino ethnicity were less accepting of the program's location in the community, less likely (than Caucasians) to make positive statements about the program, and less likely to report good consequences of the program. African Americans were more likely (than Caucasians) to report that the program affects the community image positively.

Proximity to the location of the program (31st and University) was associated with less approval of the North Park program and less positive beliefs about how the program affects the community's image. Married respondents (as opposed to all others) were more likely to report unfavorable views of the program, that the program had affected them negatively, that it affects the community negatively, and that the program affects the community's image negatively. Married respondents were also less accepting of the location of the program in the community.

Level of factual information, measured by summing the number of correct responses to the set of information questions, was related positively to holding a favorable view of the needle exchange program. However, highly informed persons were more likely to believe that the program affects the community negatively and that the program affects the image of North Park negatively.

APPENDIX A: North Park Needle Exchange Program Survey Questionnaire

- INT1. Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling from the Social Science Research Laboratory at San Diego State University. We're conducting a research study of peoples' views about some important social issues in North Park. Do you live in North Park? **[PROBE TO CHOOSE ONE IF ON THE BORDER BETWEEN NORTH PARK AND ANOTHER COMMUNITY; IF NO/DK/REF, THANK AND CODE "NQR-NP"]**
- INT2. We'd like to get a random sample, so we're asking to speak with the adult in the house with the most recent birthday. Is that you? **[SCHEDULE CB IF NEEDED; THANK AND CODE "OVER QUOTA" IF ONLY ELIGIBLE RESPONDENTS IN CLOSED QUOTA GROUP]**
- TOP. Dr. Susan Baer of the School of Public Administration and Urban Studies here at SDSU is conducting this research study to learn more about what North Park residents think regarding some public health issues. The results will help inform our students, and may help reduce risks of certain illnesses in the community. **[CODE TOP=0]**
- [ONLY IF ASKED MORE ABOUT TOPIC:]** Some questions focus on your views of issues related to drug use, and related community programs. **[CODE TOP=1]**
- [ONLY IF ASKED WHO IS SPONSOR:]** This project is sponsored by Family Health Centers of San Diego. **[CODE TOP=2]**
- [NOTE: IF BOTH TOPIC AND SPONSOR INFO GIVEN, CODE TOP=3]**
- SEX. **[RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT:]**
1 - MALE 2 - FEMALE 3-TRANSGENDER

----- **QUALIFIED RESPONDENT: QUOTAS CHECKED, DATA SAVED** -----

- LP. **[IF INDICATED BY AN ACCENT:]** Would you prefer that we speak in English or Spanish?
1 - ENGLISH 2 - SPANISH ---> **USE SPANISH VERSION OR SCHEDULE SPAN CB**
- IC. Let me assure you this phone number was generated randomly, so no names or addresses are associated with the telephone numbers, and all responses are completely anonymous. Of course, your participation is voluntary, and you may end the interview at any time. The questions should take about 30 minutes. (We know that some people have formed opinions about these issues and some have not; just let me know if you have no opinion on any questions.)
To ensure that my work is done honestly and correctly, this call may be monitored by my supervisor. (My supervisor randomly listens to interviews to make sure we're reading the questions exactly as written and not influencing answers in any way.)
Are you willing to participate? **[IF NO, THANK AND CODE "QUAL REF"; IF YES:]**
Is this a good time to get started? **[IF NOT, SCHEDULE "PART-IC"]**

Q1. To start off with, about how many years have you been living in the North Park area?
**[RECORD CUMMULATIVE YEARS IF BREAK IN NORTH PARK RESIDENCE;
 ROUND TO NEAREST EVEN NUMBERED YEAR]**

_____ YEARS [ENTER "0" IF 6 MONTHS OR LESS]
 99-DK/REF

Q2. How interested are you in political and social issues in North Park? Would you say you are...*

- 1 - not interested at all,
- 2 - not very interested,
- 3 - interested, or
- 4 - very interested?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q3. People use a variety of ways to find out what is going on in their community. So far as North Park is concerned, would you say that you learn of community events from...**
 very often, often, not very often or not at all? (ITEMS ON LIST RANDOMLY ROTATED)

(Do you learn of community events from...)	<u>VERY OFTEN</u>	<u>OFTEN</u>	<u>NOT VERY OFTEN</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL</u>	<u>DK/ REF</u>
1) community meetings	4	3	2	1	9
2) newspapers.....	4	3	2	1	9
3) community newsletters.....	4	3	2	1	9
4) posters.....	4	3	2	1	9
5) radio	4	3	2	1	9
6) TV.....	4	3	2	1	9
7) family members.....	4	3	2	1	9
8) friends or neighbors.....	4	3	2	1	9
9) people at work or school	4	3	2	1	9
10) politicians and public officials	4	3	2	1	9
11) Do you learn of community events <u>very often</u> from any <u>other</u> source? [IF YES, SPECIFY:]					

99-NO/DK/REF

Q4. What would you say is the most important problem facing people in your neighborhood?
[PROBE FOR AND RECORD ONE MAIN RESPONSE]

99-DK/REF

Q5. How much do you agree or disagree with the following two statements? The first one is: Politicians care what people like me think about policies that affect our lives. Do you...*

- 1 - strongly disagree,
- 2 - somewhat disagree,
- 3 - somewhat agree, or
- 4 - strongly agree?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q6. The second one is: Politicians do what is in the best interest of the public. Do you...*

- 1 - strongly disagree,
- 2 - somewhat disagree,
- 3 - somewhat agree, or
- 4 - strongly agree?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q7. There has been some discussion about injection drug users and ways to help them in North Park. By "injection drug users" we mean people who inject illegal drugs into the skin or vein. How much have you heard about injection drug use in North Park? Would you say you have heard...*

- 1 - nothing at all,
- 2 - not much,
- 3 - some, or
- 4 - a great deal?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q8. So far as you know, are there...*

- 1 - no injection drug users in North Park,
- 2 - not very many,
- 3 - some,
- 4 - quite a few, or
- 5 - a large number of injection drug users in North Park?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q9. To what extent do you think that injection drug users in your neighborhood affect you and the way you live? Do injection drug users affect you...*

- 1 - not at all,
- 2 - not much,
- 3 - some, or
- 4 - a great deal?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q10. How much of an issue, if any, is the presence of injection drug users in North Park? Would you say that injection drug users are...*

- 1 - not an issue at all in North Park,
- 2 - not a very important issue,
- 3 - an important issue, or
- 4 - a very important issue in North Park?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q11. To what extent do you think that you yourself can influence the problem of injection drug users in North Park? Can you influence the problem...*

- 1 - not at all,
- 2 - not much,
- 3 - some, or
- 4 - a great deal?
- 9 - DK/REF/"NO PROBLEM" VOLUNTEERED

Q12. In your opinion, what one specific thing should be done to reduce the spread of diseases like HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C that can occur when people share needles?
[PROBE FOR AND RECORD ONE MAIN RESPONSE]

99-DK/REF

Q13. Some people feel that one way to help prevent this problem is to offer needle exchange programs for injection drug users. Needle exchange programs involve agencies providing clean needles to drug users and others who inject themselves in exchange for used ones, in hopes of minimizing the spread of contagious diseases like HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C.

In general, would you say you...* **(REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)**

- 1 - disapprove strongly,
- 2 - disapprove,
- 3 - approve,
- 4 - approve strongly,
- 5 - or have no opinion at all about such needle exchange programs?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q14. Following are some perceptions people have reported about the consequences of needle exchange programs for a community. For each one, please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly. Needle exchange programs generally...**

	<u>AGREE</u> <u>STGLY</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>DISAGR</u>	<u>DISAG</u> <u>STGLY</u>	<u>DK/</u> <u>REF</u>
1) improve the quality of life in a community	4	3	2	1	9
2) attract drug dealers to the community	4	3	2	1	9
3) lower property values in the community	4	3	2	1	9
4) reduce public health care costs for treating people with HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C	4	3	2	1	9
5) reduce the spread of communicable diseases in the community	4	3	2	1	9
6) decrease crime in the community.....	4	3	2	1	9
7) increase conflict in the community	4	3	2	1	9
8) attract homeless people to the community.....	4	3	2	1	9

Q15. Thinking now just about North Park, have you heard...*

- 1 - nothing at all about a needle exchange program in North Park, ----- > **GO TO Q16**
- 2 - not much,
- 3 - some, or
- 4 - a great deal about a needle exchange program in North Park?
- 9 - DK/REF ----- > **GO TO Q16**

Q15a. **[IF HEARD ANYTHING ON Q15:]** To what extent did you hear about a needle exchange program in North Park from each of the following sources? Would you say that you heard about a North Park needle exchange program from...** very often, often, not very often, or not at all? **[IF DROVE BY OR VISITED THE PROGRAM, ASK HOW THEY HEARD ABOUT IT OR CONFIRMED WHAT THE PROGRAM DID AND RECORD BELOW]**

(Have you heard about a North Park needle exchange program from...)	<u>VERY OFTEN</u>	<u>OFTEN</u>	<u>NOT VERY OFTEN</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL</u>	<u>DK/REF</u>
1) community meetings	4	3	2	1	9
2) newspapers.....	4	3	2	1	9
3) community newsletters.....	4	3	2	1	9
4) posters.....	4	3	2	1	9
5) radio	4	3	2	1	9
6) TV.....	4	3	2	1	9
7) family members.....	4	3	2	1	9
8) friends or neighbors.....	4	3	2	1	9
9) people at work or school	4	3	2	1	9
10) politicians and public officials	4	3	2	1	9

Q15ax. Did you hear about the North Park needle exchange program very often from any other source? **[IF YES, SPECIFY:]**

99-NO/DK/REF

Q15b. About when did you first hear anything about the needle exchange program in North Park? **[PROBE FOR AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE, I.E., IF NO MONTH, AT LEAST A SEASON]**

99-DK/REF

Q16. As you may or may not know, there has been a "pilot" needle exchange program operating in North Park since February of 2003. To what extent do you think that having a needle exchange program in North Park affects you and the way you live? Does it affect you...* (By "pilot" we mean a trial program.)

- 1 - not at all,
- 2 - not much,
- 3 - some, or
- 4 - a great deal?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q17. From what you know or have heard, would you say you...* (REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)
[IF RESPONDENT FEELS NEUTRAL BECAUSE PROs AND CONs SEEM TO CANCEL EACH OTHER OUT, CODE AS "NO OPINION"]

- 1 - disapprove strongly,
- 2 - disapprove,
- 3 - approve,
- 4 - approve strongly,
- 5 - or have no opinion about the North Park needle exchange program? -- > **GO TO Q18**
- 9 - DK/REF ----- > **GO TO Q18**

Q17a-b. **[IF APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE ON Q17:]** What would you say is the most important reason why you {approve/disapprove} of the pilot needle exchange program in North Park? **[PROBE FOR AND RECORD ONE MAIN RESPONSE; RECORD SECOND RESPONSE ONLY IF MENTIONED]**

- a) _____
- b) _____
- 99-DK/REF

Q18. Based on what you know or have heard, do you...* (REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)

- 1 - strongly oppose,
- 2 - somewhat oppose,
- 3 - somewhat favor,
- 4 - strongly favor,
- 5 - or have no opinion about the current needle exchange program becoming a permanent program located in North Park?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q19. To what extent do you think that you yourself can influence whether or not a permanent needle exchange program is located in North Park? Would you say you could influence this...*

- 1 - not at all,
- 2 - not much,
- 3 - some, or
- 4 - a great deal?
- 9 - DK/REF

[IF HEARD "NOTHING AT ALL" IN Q15, GO DIRECTLY TO Q21e NOW; OTHERWISE:]

Q20. Has your view about the needle exchange program in North Park changed at all since last February 2003, or not?

- 1 - YES
- 2 - NO ----- > **GO TO Q21a**
- 9 - DK/REF ----- > **GO TO Q21a**

Q20a. **[IF YES:]** Is your view of the North Park needle exchange program now...*
(REVERSE OPTIONS 1-2 ONLY)

- 1 - more positive,
- 2 - more negative, or
- 3 - more neutral than it was before the program actually started?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q20b. What is the one main reason why your view changed? **[PROBE FOR AND RECORD ONE MAIN RESPONSE]**

99-DK/REF

Q21a. Some people have heard a great deal about the North Park pilot needle exchange program, while others have not heard much about it. Do you happen to know the main location of the program? **[DO NOT READ; ADDITIONAL LANDMARKS TO BE PROVIDED IN THE INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS; "CORRECT" IF WITHIN A 2-BLOCK RADIUS, I.E., "one block north of the library", "in the vacant lot across from Bank of America", ETC.]**

- 1 - CORRECT: University and 31st St
- 2 - INCORRECT
- 9 - DK/REF

Q21b. Do you happen to know if the program uses...*

- 1 - a mobile van, or
- 2 - an office building?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q21c. Do you happen to know whether or not any other services are offered, besides exchanging clean needles for used ones?

- 1 - YES, OTHER SERVICES ARE OFFERED
- 2 - NO OTHER SERVICES ARE OFFERED ----- > GO TO Q21e
- 9 - DK/REF ----- > GO TO Q21e

Q21d. **[IF YES:]** What other services have you heard are offered? **[DO NOT READ; RECORD ALL MENTIONED; PROBE:]** Anything else?

- 1) HARM REDUCTION KITS [SEE DESCRIPTION IN INSTRUCTIONS]
- 2) EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS
- 3) CONDOMS
- 4) COUNSELING/CASE MANAGEMENT
- 5) REFERRALS TO DETOX/REHAB PROGRAMS
- 6) REFERRALS TO HEP C/HIV TESTING
- 7) OTHER, SPECIFY: _____
- 8) DK/REF

[ASK EVERYONE:]

Q21e. From what you know or have heard, do you believe the following statement is true or false? A needle exchange program such as the one in North Park is one of the few legal places where someone can dispose of used needles in California.

- 1 - TRUE
- 2 - FALSE
- 9 - DK/REF

Q22. Were you personally involved in either the planning or implementation of the pilot needle exchange program, or not? **[IF YES, CLARIFY:]** Was that...

- 1 - planning, ----- > **GO TO Q23**
- 2 - implementation, ----- > **GO TO Q23**
- 3 - or both?----- > **GO TO Q23**
- 4 - NO / NEITHER
- 9 - DK/REF

Q22a. **[IF NOT INVOLVED/DK/REF ON Q22:]** What was the most important reason why you were not involved in the planning or implementation of the program?
[DO NOT READ; RECORD ONLY ONE]

- 1 - DID NOT KNOW ABOUT IT
- 2 - DID NOT CARE / NOT INTERESTED
- 3 - WOULD NOT MATTER / COULD NOT CHANGE THINGS ANYWAY
- 4 - TOO BUSY / NO TIME
- 5 - OTHER, SPECIFY: _____
- 9 - DK/REF

Q23. Have you spoken about this program with anyone else who was involved in the planning or implementation stages, or not? **[IF YES, CLARIFY:]** Was that... **[IF SPOKE WITH MORE THAN ONE PERSON, RECORD WHICHEVER BEST DESCRIBES THEIR COMBINED LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT]**

- 1 - planning,
- 2 - implementation,
- 3 - or both?
- 4 - NO / NEITHER
- 9 - DK/REF

Q24. In terms of your own personal life, would you say that the pilot needle exchange program in North Park has had...* **(REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)**

- 1 - a very negative effect,
- 2 - somewhat negative,
- 3 - somewhat positive,
- 4 - a very positive effect,
- 5 - or no effect at all on your personal life? ----- > **GO TO Q25**
- 9 - DK/REF ----- > **GO TO Q25**

Q24a-b. **[IF POSITIVE/NEGATIVE:]** What was the one most {positive/negative} effect the pilot program has had on your personal life? **[PROBE FOR AND RECORD ONE MAIN EFFECT; RECORD SECOND EFFECT IF MENTIONED]**

a) _____

b) _____

99-DK/REF

Q25. In terms of the community itself, would you say that the pilot needle exchange program in North Park has had...* **(REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)**

1 - a very negative effect,

2 - somewhat negative,

3 - somewhat positive,

4 - a very positive effect,

5 - or no effect at all on the community of North Park? ----- > **GO TO Q26**

9 - DK/REF ----- > **GO TO Q26**

Q25a-b. **[IF POSITIVE/NEGATIVE:]** What was the one most {positive/negative} effect the pilot program has had on the community of North Park? **[PROBE FOR AND RECORD ONE MAIN EFFECT; RECORD SECOND EFFECT IF MENTIONED]**

a) _____

b) _____

99-DK/REF

Q26. In terms of the image of North Park, would you say that the pilot needle exchange program in North Park has had...* (By "image" we mean how North Park is viewed by people living in North Park as well as in other areas of San Diego.) **(REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)**

1 - a very negative effect,

2 - somewhat negative,

3 - somewhat positive,

4 - a very positive effect,

5 - or no effect at all on the image of North Park?

9 - DK/REF

Q27. Following are some things people have mentioned that may be consequences of needle exchange programs in local communities. So far as you know, would a needle exchange program in North Park be very likely, likely, not very likely, or not at all likely...**

(How likely, if at all, would a needle exchange program be...)	<u>VERY LIKELY</u>	<u>LIKELY</u>	<u>NOT VERY LIKELY</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL</u>	<u>DK/ REF</u>
1) to increase the number of needles left on the streets of the community?	4	3	2	1	9
2) to decrease the problem of injection drug use in the community?	4	3	2	1	9
3) to threaten the safety of children in the community?	4	3	2	1	9
4) to attract crime to the community?	4	3	2	1	9
5) to bring the community together to deal realistically with a social problem?	4	3	2	1	9
6) to lead injection drug users who use the program to seek drug addiction treatment?	4	3	2	1	9
7) to lead injection drug users who use the program to seek HIV/AIDS testing and treatment?.....	4	3	2	1	9
8) to increase injection drug addiction in the community?	4	3	2	1	9
9) to reduce the spread of HIV/AIDS in the community?	4	3	2	1	9
10) to reduce the spread of Hepatitis C infection in the community?.....	4	3	2	1	9

Q28. People have told us different things regarding the needle exchange program in North Park. From what you know or have heard, please tell me if each of the following statements is true or false, or if you don't know. The first one is...**

	<u>TRUE</u>	<u>FALSE</u>	<u>DK/REF</u>
1) The city put the needle exchange program in North Park because that is where officials think injection drug users are	1	2	9
2) Parents in North Park have become afraid to allow their children to play outside	1	2	9
3) Officials have not listened to citizens in North Park concerning the needle exchange program.....	1	2	9
4) Most citizens in North Park were not interested in providing input about plans for the needle exchange program.....	1	2	9
5) The needle exchange program is an important reason that people do not want to live in North Park.....	1	2	9
6) The needles distributed by the program are monitored (by "monitored" we mean carefully supervised and controlled)	1	2	9
7) The needle exchange program has provided immediate referrals to most clients for treatment of addiction.....	1	2	9
8) The city tried to notify all citizens of North Park about the program during its planning stages.....	1	2	9
9) North Park citizens can have some influence over how the needle exchange program is run.....	1	2	9
10) Residents had an opportunity to participate in the planning and implementation of the needle exchange program	1	2	9
11) I personally heard about a public forum where the needle exchange program was to be discussed.....	1	2	9
12) Most citizens in North Park know little about the needle exchange program that is operating here	1	2	9
13) Politicians gave funds to businesses in North Park so they would not oppose the needle exchange program.....	1	2	9
14) The city council has shown respect for the community's views about the needle exchange program.....	1	2	9
15) The city put the needle exchange program in North Park because wealthier neighborhoods did not want it.....	1	2	9
16) The police respond adequately to injection drug use crime in North Park	1	2	9

Q29. How much do you agree or disagree with the following two statements? The first one is: Special interests have too much influence over the needle exchange program. Do you...* (REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)

- 1 - disagree strongly,
- 2 - disagree,
- 3 - agree,
- 4 - agree strongly,
- 5 - or do you have no opinion?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q30. The second one is: We can trust officials who are running the needle exchange program to do what is right. Do you...* (REVERSE OPTIONS 1-4 ONLY)

- 1 - disagree strongly,
- 2 - disagree,
- 3 - agree,
- 4 - agree strongly,
- 5 - or do you have no opinion?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q31. Have you attended any community meetings concerning the North Park needle exchange program?

- 1 - YES
- 2 - NO ----- > GO TO Q32
- 9 - DK/REF ----- > GO TO Q32

Q31a. **[IF YES:]** Do you believe that these community meeting(s) provided meaningful discussion of the issues among members of the community or not?

- 1 - YES
- 2 - NO
- 9 - DK/REF

Q32. So far as you know, have officials asked the public about their views of the North Park needle exchange program, or not? **[IF ASKED, DOES NOT INCLUDE THIS SURVEY]**

- 1 - YES
- 2 - NO
- 9 - DK/REF

Q33. Some people have told us that they might support a needle exchange program in their neighborhood under some conditions but not under other conditions. Would you support a needle exchange program in North Park if the program were...**

(What if it were...)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK/REF</u>
1) located in a <u>medical</u> building?	1	2	9
2) located in a <u>permanent</u> building rather than in a van?	1	2	9
3) located in an area away from schools?	1	2	9
4) located in an area away from homes?	1	2	9
5) located on the block where your home is?	1	2	9
6) located far from your own home?	1	2	9
7) located next door or across the street from your home?	1	2	9
8) located outside of the North Park community?	1	2	9

Q34. Some citizens participate in political activities and others do not because they do not have time, have to work, spend time with their families, or are just not interested. How about you? Since you have been old enough to vote, please tell me if you've participated in each of the following activities very often, often, not very often, or not at all. The first one is...**

	<u>VERY OFTEN</u>	<u>NOT VERY OFTEN</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL</u>	<u>DK/REF</u>	
1) Voting in elections for president	4	3	2	1	9
2) Voting in elections for city council	4	3	2	1	9
3) Voting in primary elections.....	4	3	2	1	9
4) Personally contacting a city council member about a problem	4	3	2	1	9
5) Attending a neighborhood meeting to solve a problem	4	3	2	1	9
6) Talking with others in your community about a political problem	4	3	2	1	9
7) Taking an active role in a candidate's campaign for city council	4	3	2	1	9
8) Contributing money to a city council campaign	4	3	2	1	9
9) Writing a letter to a newspaper.....	4	3	2	1	9
10) Attending a meeting of the city council.....	4	3	2	1	9
11) Signing a petition.....	4	3	2	1	9

Q35. During an average 7-day week, on about how many of those days do you...

- a) Watch local TV news programs? **[INCLUDES ANY PART OF THE PROGRAM]**

_____ DAYS
9-DK/REF

- b) Read a local newspaper? **[INCLUDES ANY PART OF THE NEWSPAPER]**

_____ DAYS
9-DK/REF

- c) Listen to local news on the radio?

_____ DAYS
9-DK/REF

- d) Talk to others about local news?

_____ DAYS
9-DK/REF

- e) About how many times in the past 6 months have you read a North Park community newsletter? **[INCLUDES ANY PART OF THE NEWSLETTER]**

_____ TIMES
99-DK/REF

- f) About how many times in the past 6 months have you attended community meetings in North Park? (By "community meetings" we mean meetings attended by people living in North Park that are held specifically to address issues of public concern.)

_____ TIMES
99-DK/REF

In closing, the following questions are for comparison purposes only:

Q36. About how many blocks do you live from the intersection of 31st Street and University Avenue? (That's about halfway between the major intersection of 30th and University, and the 805 freeway. Also, it's one block north of the North Park Library, which is on the corner of 31st and North Park Way.) **[RECORD BEST ESTIMATE OF CITY BLOCKS OR IF UNABLE, TO THE NEAREST TENTH OF A MILE (1/4 = ".3"; 1/2 = ".5"; 3/4 = ".8")]**

_____ CITY BLOCKS
99-DK/REF
97-NOT USED

OR

_____ . _____ MILES
99.9-DK/REF
97.7-NOT USED

Q37. Do you own or rent your residence?

- 1 - OWN
- 2 - RENT/LEASE
- 3 - OTHER
- 9 - DK/REF

Q38. What is your age?

_____ YEARS OLD
99-DK/REF

Q39. How many years of formal schooling did you complete, that is, what is the last grade you completed? **[IF LESS THAN 8 YEARS PROBE TO BE CERTAIN THAT RESPONDENT HAS REALLY COMPLETED NO MORE THAN PART OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; CODE "8" FOR COMPLETED GRADE SCHOOL, "12" FOR HIGH SCHOOL, "16" FOR COLLEGE]**

_____ YEARS OF EDUCATION
99-DK/REF

Q40. Are you of Latino or of Mexican descent—for example Mexican, South American, or Cuban, or some other Spanish background—or are you not?

- 1 - YES
- 2 - NO
- 9 - DK/REF

Q41. What is your race or ethnicity?

- 1 - WHITE
- 2 - AFRICAN-AMERICAN
- 3 - HISPANIC
- 4 - ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER
- 5 - OTHER, SPECIFY: _____
- 9 - DK/REF

Q42. What is your current marital status?

- 1 - MARRIED
- 2 - WIDOWED
- 3 - DIVORCED/SEPARATED
- 4 - SINGLE
- 5 - COHABITING
- 9 - DK/REF

Q43. Would you describe yourself as...*

- 1 - a strong Republican,
- 2 - a weak Republican,
- 3 - a leaning Republican,
- 4 - an Independent,
- 5 - a leaning Democrat,
- 6 - a weak Democrat,
- 7 - a strong Democrat,
- 8 - something else,
- 9 - or do you not think of yourself in those terms?
- 99 - DK/REF

Q44. Would you describe yourself as...* (REVERSE OPTIONS 1-5 ONLY)

- 1 - strongly conservative,
- 2 - conservative,
- 3 - middle-of-the-road,
- 4 - liberal,
- 5 - strongly liberal,
- 6 - or do you not think of yourself in those terms?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q45. Which of the following best describes your religious faith, if any...

- 1 - Protestant,
- 2 - Catholic,
- 3 - Jewish,
- 4 - Muslim,
- 5 - Buddhist,
- 6 - another faith,
- 7 - or none?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q46. Some people tell us they attend religious services regularly, while others say that they do not attend at all. How about you? Do you attend religious services...*

- 1 - about once a week,
- 2 - about once a month,
- 3 - several times a year,
- 4 - once a year or less,
- 5 - or not at all? ----- > GO TO Q47
- 9 - DK/REF

Q46a. [ONLY ASK IF Q45=PROTESTANT AND Q46=ATTEND SERVICES/DK/REF:]
What church do you usually attend? [PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DENOMINATION/ NAME OF CHURCH; ASK FOR SPELLING IF NOT ABSOLUTELY SURE]

99-DK/REF

Q47. Now, we don't want to know your exact income, but just roughly, could you tell me if your annual household income before taxes is...

- 1 - under \$10,000,
- 2 - \$10,000 up to but not including \$20,000,
- 3 - \$20,000 up to (but not including) \$30,000,
- 4 - \$30,000 up to (but not including) \$40,000,
- 5 - \$40,000 up to (but not including) \$50,000,
- 6 - \$50,000 up to (but not including) \$60,000,
- 7 - \$60,000 up to (but not including) \$70,000, or
- 8 - \$70,000 or more?
- 9 - DK/REF

Q48. We don't want to know your exact address, but what is the major intersection closest to where you live? [PROBE FOR AND RECORD TWO SEPARATE STREETS; ASK FOR SPELLING IF NOT ABSOLUTELY SURE; IF DK/REF, ASK FOR ZIP CODE INSTEAD; CONFIRM RESPONSES WITH:] So these two streets, {INSERT} and {INSERT}, actually cross each other (or intersect) somewhere close to your house, right?

- a) FIRST STREET/ZIP: _____ 99-REF
- b) SECOND STREET: _____ 99-DK/REF

Q49. Have you personally ever used syringes or intravenous needles for any reason? [INCLUDES USING NEEDLES ON OTHERS OR AS PART OF THEIR JOB; INCLUDES USING BOTH LEGAL AND ILLEGAL DRUGS]

- 1 - YES
- 2 - NO
- 9 - DK/REF

LAN. [LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW:] 1 - ENGLISH 2 - SPANISH

PHN. Those are all the questions I have. [ONLY IF NOT ON CATI:] I'd like to confirm that I reached you at...

[VERIFY AND INSERT TELEPHONE NUMBER:] _____

NAM. In case my supervisor should need to verify this interview, may I please have just your first name or initials? Your name and phone number will be separated from your responses to these questions and destroyed after the data has been processed.

[VERIFY AND INSERT RESPONDENT'S NAME:] _____
[THANK RESPONDENT; RECORD REMAINING INFORMATION BELOW]

TIN. **[INTERVIEWER NUMBER:] _____**

LEN. **[LENGTH OF INTERVIEW IN MINUTES:] _____**

DAT. **[DATE OF INTERVIEW:] _____**

REC. **[CATI RECORD NUMBER:] _____**

VER. **[VERSION OF INTERVIEW:] 1 - VERSION A 2 - VERSION B***

* = RESPONSE OPTIONS REVERSED ON VERSION B FOR ALL QUESTIONS INDICATED

** = ITEMS ON LIST RANDOMLY ROTATED FOR ALL QUESTIONS INDICATED

APPENDIX B: Crosstabulations

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %

Q13. APPROVE NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS										
DISAPPR STR	11.9%	6.9%	12.1%	9.4%	9.4%	10.1%	7.7%	15.2%	10.2%	9.7%
DISAPPR	12.7%	11.7%	13.8%	19.8%	13.3%	5.1%	13.7%	10.4%	10.9%	13.2%
NEUTRAL	10.4%	5.5%	7.8%	9.4%	7.2%	6.1%	8.5%	6.4%	4.4%	9.7%
APPROVE	31.3%	30.3%	29.3%	26.0%	27.8%	38.4%	31.4%	30.4%	34.3%	29.2%
APPROVE STR	33.6%	45.5%	37.1%	35.4%	42.2%	40.4%	38.7%	37.6%	40.1%	38.1%

Q17. APPROVAL OF NORTH PARK PROGRAM										
DISAPPR STR	8.2%	9.0%	11.2%	10.4%	6.7%	11.1%	7.7%	12.8%	12.4%	7.4%
DISAPPR	9.0%	9.7%	7.8%	7.3%	10.6%	9.1%	8.1%	11.2%	9.5%	8.9%
NEUTRAL	18.7%	19.3%	32.8%	22.9%	25.6%	13.1%	25.5%	19.2%	24.1%	23.3%
APPROVE	45.5%	35.2%	30.2%	38.5%	35.6%	43.4%	35.8%	39.2%	32.1%	39.3%
APPROVE STR	18.7%	26.9%	18.1%	20.8%	21.7%	23.2%	22.9%	17.6%	21.9%	21.0%

Q16. EXTENT PILOT PROGRAM AFFECTS ME										
NOT AT ALL	57.5%	59.6%	63.2%	55.3%	64.2%	55.7%	61.0%	56.1%	53.7%	63.1%
NOT MUCH	17.9%	16.3%	10.5%	11.7%	15.1%	20.6%	14.6%	17.1%	19.9%	13.1%
SOME	15.7%	17.7%	16.7%	21.3%	15.1%	15.5%	16.5%	17.1%	16.2%	16.3%
A GREAT DEAL	9.0%	6.4%	9.6%	11.7%	5.6%	8.2%	7.9%	9.8%	10.3%	7.5%

Q24. PROGRAM EFFECT ON OWN LIFE										
VERY NEG	3.0%	2.1%	6.0%	5.2%	1.7%	5.1%	2.6%	5.6%	5.8%	2.3%
SOMEWT NEG	6.0%	4.8%	6.0%	3.1%	5.6%	7.1%	5.2%	6.4%	7.3%	4.3%
NEUTRAL	81.3%	81.4%	75.9%	80.2%	79.4%	80.8%	79.3%	80.8%	76.6%	82.1%
SOMEWHT POS	7.5%	8.3%	10.3%	9.4%	10.6%	5.1%	9.6%	6.4%	8.0%	8.9%
VERY POS	2.2%	3.4%	1.7%	2.1%	2.8%	2.0%	3.3%	.8%	2.2%	2.3%

Q25. PROGRAM EFFECT ON COMMUNITY										
VERY NEG	2.2%	4.8%	11.2%	6.3%	5.0%	6.1%	4.8%	8.0%	10.9%	2.7%
SOMEWT NEG	13.4%	13.8%	6.0%	9.4%	10.0%	15.2%	9.6%	14.4%	10.2%	12.1%
NEUTRAL	47.0%	42.1%	50.9%	46.9%	50.0%	37.4%	47.2%	44.8%	46.0%	47.5%
SOMEWHT POS	28.4%	29.7%	25.0%	28.1%	27.8%	32.3%	28.4%	26.4%	27.0%	27.6%
VERY POS	9.0%	9.7%	6.9%	9.4%	7.2%	9.1%	10.0%	6.4%	5.8%	10.1%

Q26. EFFECT OF PROGRAM ON NORTH PARK IMAGE										
VERY NEG	6.7%	5.5%	8.6%	9.4%	5.0%	7.1%	5.2%	10.4%	10.2%	4.7%
SOMEWT NEG	17.9%	17.9%	23.3%	9.4%	20.0%	27.3%	20.3%	17.6%	22.6%	17.9%
NEUTRAL	51.5%	49.0%	41.4%	52.1%	46.1%	44.4%	46.5%	50.4%	46.0%	48.6%
SOMEWHT POS	20.9%	19.3%	20.7%	20.8%	24.4%	14.1%	23.6%	12.0%	16.1%	22.2%
VERY POS	3.0%	8.3%	6.0%	8.3%	4.4%	7.1%	4.4%	9.6%	5.1%	6.6%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q2.INTEREST IN NORTH PARK POLITICAL/SOCIAL										
NOT INTERESTED	9.8%	5.6%	4.3%	6.3%	7.3%	5.1%	7.8%	4.0%	4.4%	7.8%
NOT VERY INTERESTED	27.8%	15.3%	16.4%	30.2%	21.8%	8.1%	22.6%	15.3%	10.9%	24.7%
INTERESTED	42.9%	54.2%	50.9%	47.9%	47.5%	54.5%	47.4%	52.4%	50.4%	49.0%
VERY INTERESTED	19.5%	25.0%	28.4%	15.6%	23.5%	32.3%	22.2%	28.2%	34.3%	18.4%
Q6.POLITICIANS DO WHAT IS IN BEST INTEREST										
STRONGLY DISAGREE	23.1%	26.1%	23.2%	24.2%	26.3%	19.6%	24.8%	22.0%	23.3%	24.2%
SOMewhat DISAGREE	32.3%	28.9%	28.6%	31.6%	28.6%	32.0%	29.0%	31.7%	27.8%	31.3%
SOMewhat AGREE	34.6%	40.1%	41.1%	33.7%	40.6%	41.2%	38.9%	38.2%	42.9%	36.1%
STRONGLY AGREE	10.0%	4.9%	7.1%	10.5%	4.6%	7.2%	7.3%	8.1%	6.0%	8.3%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK										
NOTHING AT ALL	39.6%	22.1%	20.7%	27.1%	31.7%	21.2%	28.8%	24.8%	16.8%	33.1%
NOT MUCH	20.9%	23.4%	21.6%	24.0%	24.4%	17.2%	22.9%	20.8%	15.3%	25.3%
SOME	28.4%	35.2%	34.5%	36.5%	27.2%	36.4%	31.7%	34.4%	38.0%	30.7%
A GREAT DEAL	11.2%	19.3%	23.3%	12.5%	16.7%	25.3%	16.6%	20.0%	29.9%	10.9%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK										
NOTHING AT ALL	39.6%	22.1%	20.7%	27.1%	31.7%	21.2%	28.8%	24.8%	16.8%	33.1%
NOT MUCH	20.9%	23.4%	21.6%	24.0%	24.4%	17.2%	22.9%	20.8%	15.3%	25.3%
SOME	28.4%	35.2%	34.5%	36.5%	27.2%	36.4%	31.7%	34.4%	38.0%	30.7%
A GREAT DEAL	11.2%	19.3%	23.3%	12.5%	16.7%	25.3%	16.6%	20.0%	29.9%	10.9%
Q9.IV USERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD AFFECT YOU										
NOT AT ALL	33.8%	35.4%	31.9%	35.8%	33.1%	32.7%	35.4%	30.1%	31.3%	35.7%
NOT MUCH	21.1%	22.9%	23.9%	16.8%	21.9%	31.6%	22.8%	23.6%	29.1%	19.6%
SOME	24.8%	27.8%	31.0%	25.3%	29.8%	24.5%	27.6%	27.6%	25.4%	28.2%
A GREAT DEAL	20.3%	13.9%	13.3%	22.1%	15.2%	11.2%	14.2%	18.7%	14.2%	16.5%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q10.ISSUE OF PRESENCE OF ID USERS										
NOT AN ISSUE	10.9%	10.0%	9.1%	7.7%	13.8%	6.3%	10.6%	8.1%	10.4%	9.5%
NOT VERY IMPRINT	19.5%	17.9%	22.7%	20.9%	16.7%	24.0%	21.7%	16.1%	19.4%	20.2%
IMPORTANT	44.5%	45.0%	42.7%	40.7%	45.4%	43.8%	47.2%	38.7%	47.0%	43.0%
VERY IMPORTANT	25.0%	27.1%	25.5%	30.8%	24.1%	26.0%	20.5%	37.1%	23.1%	27.3%
Q11.CAN INFLUENCE INJECTION DRUG USE										
NOT AT ALL	29.0%	29.7%	40.4%	38.5%	34.3%	23.5%	32.5%	33.3%	33.6%	32.5%
NOT MUCH	28.2%	26.9%	24.6%	20.8%	28.7%	30.6%	27.6%	24.4%	24.6%	27.5%
SOME	29.8%	40.7%	29.8%	31.3%	30.9%	40.8%	33.6%	33.3%	36.6%	31.8%
A GREAT DEAL	13.0%	2.8%	5.3%	9.4%	6.2%	5.1%	6.3%	8.9%	5.2%	8.2%
Q15.AMOUNT HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM IN NORTH PARK										
NOTHING AT ALL	69.4%	44.8%	44.8%	57.3%	56.7%	40.4%	55.4%	48.8%	36.5%	61.5%
NOT MUCH	10.4%	14.5%	14.7%	16.7%	13.9%	10.1%	11.8%	15.2%	9.5%	15.2%
SOME	14.9%	26.9%	28.4%	18.8%	21.1%	31.3%	24.0%	22.4%	35.0%	17.5%
A GREAT DEAL	5.2%	13.8%	12.1%	7.3%	8.3%	18.2%	8.9%	13.6%	19.0%	5.8%
Q18.FAVOR/OPOSE PROGRAM BEING PERMANENT										
STRONG OPPOSE	14.2%	13.1%	17.2%	16.7%	12.2%	15.2%	11.8%	20.8%	16.8%	13.2%
OPPOSE	6.0%	5.5%	5.2%	3.1%	7.2%	6.1%	5.9%	4.8%	5.1%	5.8%
NEUTRAL	20.1%	20.7%	24.1%	24.0%	21.7%	15.2%	23.2%	17.6%	16.1%	24.9%
FAVOR	28.4%	24.1%	19.8%	19.8%	27.2%	26.3%	24.4%	24.8%	30.7%	21.0%
STRONG FAVOR	31.3%	36.6%	33.6%	36.5%	31.7%	37.4%	34.7%	32.0%	31.4%	35.0%
Q19.ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PERMANENT PROGRAM										
NOT AT ALL	22.1%	15.2%	38.7%	23.4%	29.5%	12.2%	27.5%	17.1%	23.3%	25.3%
NOT MUCH	26.7%	29.7%	23.4%	20.2%	30.1%	30.6%	26.0%	29.3%	27.8%	26.5%
SOME	40.5%	46.9%	29.7%	41.5%	35.8%	45.9%	37.4%	44.7%	39.8%	39.1%
A GREAT DEAL	10.7%	8.3%	8.1%	14.9%	4.5%	11.2%	9.1%	8.9%	9.0%	9.1%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q20.VIEW OF PROGRAM CHANGED SINCE FEB 2003										
YES	20.0%	16.0%	10.2%	16.7%	14.9%	14.0%	14.7%	17.2%	17.9%	13.2%
NO	80.0%	84.0%	89.8%	83.3%	85.1%	86.0%	85.3%	82.8%	82.1%	86.8%
Q20A.CURRENT VIEW OF PROGRAM										
MORE POSITIVE	62.5%	50.0%	16.7%	66.7%	36.4%	50.0%	47.1%	50.0%	40.0%	58.3%
MORE NEGATIVE	37.5%	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%	54.5%	37.5%	47.1%	40.0%	46.7%	41.7%
MORE NEUTRAL	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	9.1%	12.5%	5.9%	10.0%	13.3%	.0%
Q21A.KNOW PROGRAM MAIN LOCATION										
0	94.8%	86.2%	84.5%	90.6%	92.2%	79.8%	90.4%	84.8%	80.3%	93.0%
CORRECT	5.2%	13.8%	15.5%	9.4%	7.8%	20.2%	9.6%	15.2%	19.7%	7.0%
Q21B.KNOW USE MOBILE VAN										
0	91.8%	82.8%	83.6%	92.7%	87.2%	76.8%	88.2%	81.6%	75.2%	91.8%
MOBILE VAN	8.2%	17.2%	16.4%	7.3%	12.8%	23.2%	11.8%	18.4%	24.8%	8.2%
Q21C.KNOW OTHER SERVICES										
0	94.0%	86.2%	89.7%	97.9%	89.4%	81.8%	91.1%	87.2%	86.1%	91.8%
YES	6.0%	13.8%	10.3%	2.1%	10.6%	18.2%	8.9%	12.8%	13.9%	8.2%
Q21E.PROGRAM IS ONE PLACE TO DISPOSE NEEDLES										
0	41.8%	42.8%	45.7%	41.7%	42.8%	45.5%	44.6%	41.6%	42.3%	44.0%
TRUE	58.2%	57.2%	54.3%	58.3%	57.2%	54.5%	55.4%	58.4%	57.7%	56.0%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q22. PERSONALLY INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN										
PLANNING	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.4%
IMPLEMENTATION	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
NO/NEITHER	99.2%	99.3%	100.0%	100.0%	99.4%	99.0%	99.6%	99.2%	100.0%	99.2%
Q22A.WHY NOT INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN										
DIDN'T KNOW	68.0%	55.7%	56.6%	67.0%	59.5%	54.7%	62.0%	56.0%	54.2%	63.5%
DIDN'T CARE	8.6%	12.9%	13.3%	12.8%	11.6%	9.5%	12.0%	10.3%	13.0%	10.8%
WOULDN'T MATTER	1.6%	2.1%	.9%	1.1%	1.2%	2.1%	1.5%	1.7%	2.3%	1.2%
TOO BUSY/NO TIME	9.4%	13.6%	8.0%	6.4%	12.7%	12.6%	7.5%	15.5%	13.7%	8.8%
OTHER	12.5%	15.7%	21.2%	12.8%	15.0%	21.1%	16.9%	16.4%	16.8%	15.7%
Q23.SPOKE ABOUT PROGRAM TO OTHERS INVOLVED										
PLANNING	.0%	.7%	1.7%	.0%	.6%	2.0%	.7%	.0%	2.2%	.0%
IMPLEMENTATION	.0%	1.4%	.9%	.0%	1.1%	1.0%	.7%	1.6%	.7%	1.2%
BOTH	2.3%	3.5%	3.5%	1.0%	2.2%	6.1%	3.7%	1.6%	5.2%	1.9%
NO/NEITHER	97.7%	94.4%	93.9%	99.0%	96.1%	90.8%	94.8%	96.7%	91.8%	96.9%
Q29. SPECIAL INTERESTS HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENC										
DISAGREE STR	8.2%	11.7%	12.9%	6.3%	12.8%	13.1%	7.7%	16.8%	15.3%	8.2%
DISAGREE	23.9%	19.3%	14.7%	25.0%	18.9%	17.2%	18.1%	21.6%	14.6%	21.8%
NEUTRAL	55.2%	55.9%	61.2%	60.4%	56.1%	50.5%	60.1%	52.8%	48.9%	62.6%
AGREE	6.7%	11.0%	7.8%	4.2%	8.3%	15.2%	9.2%	7.2%	16.8%	4.3%
AGREE STR	6.0%	2.1%	3.4%	4.2%	3.9%	4.0%	4.8%	1.6%	4.4%	3.1%
Q30.CAN TRUST OFFICIALS RUNNING PROGRAM										
DISAGREE STR	8.2%	10.3%	4.3%	8.3%	7.2%	8.1%	8.1%	7.2%	8.0%	7.4%
DISAGREE	11.9%	11.0%	14.7%	10.4%	16.1%	8.1%	11.8%	13.6%	13.1%	12.5%
NEUTRAL	23.1%	18.6%	29.3%	22.9%	22.8%	23.2%	25.5%	20.0%	22.6%	23.7%
AGREE	47.0%	44.1%	41.4%	46.9%	41.1%	47.5%	42.8%	45.6%	46.0%	42.8%
AGREE STR	9.7%	15.9%	10.3%	11.5%	12.8%	13.1%	11.8%	13.6%	10.2%	13.6%
Q31.ATTENDED COMMUNITY MEETINGS ON PROGRAM										
YES	2.2%	3.5%	4.3%	1.1%	2.2%	7.1%	3.0%	4.0%	6.6%	1.6%
NO	97.8%	96.5%	95.7%	98.9%	97.8%	92.9%	97.0%	96.0%	93.4%	98.4%
Q31A.MEETINGS PROVIDED MEANINGFUL DISCUSS OF										
YES	100.0%	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	87.5%	80.0%	77.8%	100.0%
NO	.0%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	12.5%	20.0%	22.2%	.0%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q32. PUBLIC WAS ASKED ABOUT VIEWS OF PROGRAM										
YES	14.7%	29.1%	25.0%	15.6%	19.4%	36.8%	23.6%	22.5%	31.0%	18.0%
NO	85.3%	70.9%	75.0%	84.4%	80.6%	63.2%	76.4%	77.5%	69.0%	82.0%
EDUCATION										
0-12	29.1%	19.3%	19.8%	41.7%	20.0%	6.1%	21.4%	26.6%	12.4%	28.4%
13-16	33.6%	33.1%	30.2%	36.5%	34.4%	25.3%	35.1%	25.8%	27.7%	35.0%
17+	37.3%	47.6%	50.0%	21.9%	45.6%	68.7%	43.5%	47.6%	59.9%	36.6%
LATINO										
00	67.2%	81.4%	88.8%	70.8%	81.1%	83.8%	84.5%	66.4%	83.2%	76.7%
LATINO	32.8%	18.6%	11.2%	29.2%	18.9%	16.2%	15.5%	33.6%	16.8%	23.3%
RACE										
CAUCASIAN	42.7%	67.1%	77.5%	59.6%	61.5%	67.3%	68.3%	47.5%	73.1%	55.6%
AFR-AMER	6.9%	9.3%	1.8%	5.3%	6.9%	6.1%	5.0%	8.3%	1.5%	8.8%
HISPANIC	33.6%	19.3%	11.7%	29.8%	19.5%	16.3%	16.0%	35.0%	17.7%	24.0%
ASIAN	3.1%	1.4%	.9%	1.1%	2.3%	2.0%	1.5%	2.5%	1.5%	2.0%
OTHER	13.7%	2.9%	8.1%	4.3%	9.8%	8.2%	9.2%	6.7%	6.2%	9.6%
PARTY										
REPUBLICAN	15.6%	6.3%	25.8%	16.4%	16.3%	12.9%	12.8%	21.1%	17.3%	14.5%
INDEP	28.6%	35.1%	25.8%	39.3%	29.5%	22.4%	32.3%	25.6%	21.8%	35.3%
DEMOCRAT	55.8%	58.6%	48.5%	44.3%	54.3%	64.7%	54.9%	53.3%	60.9%	50.3%
IDEOLOGY										
CONSERVATIVE	15.5%	13.3%	24.6%	18.3%	20.1%	11.3%	14.0%	24.6%	15.7%	18.3%
MID ROAD	41.9%	43.4%	35.1%	46.2%	40.2%	32.0%	42.8%	36.9%	36.6%	43.0%
LIBERAL	42.6%	43.4%	40.4%	35.5%	39.7%	56.7%	43.2%	38.5%	47.8%	38.6%
Q45. RELIGIOUS FAITH										
PROTESTANT	12.9%	20.1%	33.0%	21.9%	19.2%	23.5%	21.2%	22.1%	22.8%	20.1%
CATHOLIC	32.6%	28.5%	24.3%	33.3%	26.6%	26.5%	25.7%	35.2%	26.5%	29.9%
JEWISH	1.5%	1.4%	3.5%	2.1%	.6%	5.1%	1.9%	2.5%	2.9%	1.6%
MUSLIM	.8%	.7%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.4%	.8%	.0%	.8%
BUDDHIST	3.0%	2.8%	2.6%	.0%	4.0%	4.1%	3.3%	1.6%	2.2%	2.8%
OTHER	17.4%	22.9%	19.1%	17.7%	22.0%	19.4%	21.2%	16.4%	18.4%	20.9%
NONE	31.8%	23.6%	17.4%	25.0%	26.6%	21.4%	26.4%	21.3%	27.2%	24.0%
Q46. FREQUENCY ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES										
ONCE A WEEK	21.8%	21.5%	27.4%	24.0%	19.2%	26.5%	21.1%	28.2%	20.6%	24.9%
ONCE A MONTH	10.5%	9.0%	9.7%	11.5%	11.3%	6.1%	9.0%	11.3%	9.6%	9.9%
SEVERAL TIMES/YR	24.8%	27.1%	15.9%	17.7%	24.3%	23.5%	22.9%	23.4%	21.3%	23.7%
ONCE A YEAR/LESS	7.5%	11.8%	9.7%	10.4%	8.5%	11.2%	10.9%	7.3%	13.2%	7.9%
NOT AT ALL	35.3%	30.6%	37.2%	36.5%	36.7%	32.7%	36.1%	29.8%	35.3%	33.6%
Q49. EVER USED SYRINGES OR IV NEEDLES										
YES	11.9%	21.5%	12.9%	13.5%	16.1%	19.2%	13.7%	20.0%	14.7%	16.0%
NO	88.1%	78.5%	87.1%	86.5%	83.9%	80.8%	86.3%	80.0%	85.3%	84.0%
GENDER										
MALE	41.8%	57.9%	48.3%	43.8%	51.1%	53.5%	53.5%	41.6%	49.6%	49.4%
FEMALE	58.2%	42.1%	51.7%	56.3%	48.9%	46.5%	46.5%	58.4%	50.4%	50.6%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q3 1.LEARN COMMUNITY EVENTS: COMMUNITY MEETINGS										
NOT AT ALL	73.9%	59.3%	50.0%	66.7%	62.8%	55.6%	64.2%	54.4%	48.2%	68.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.9%	26.2%	37.1%	26.0%	26.1%	28.3%	24.7%	32.0%	32.8%	23.3%
3	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
OFTEN	5.2%	10.3%	8.6%	3.1%	8.3%	11.1%	7.0%	10.4%	12.4%	5.4%
VERY OFTEN	3.0%	4.1%	3.4%	4.2%	2.2%	5.1%	4.1%	2.4%	5.8%	2.3%
Q3 2.NEWSPAPERS										
NOT AT ALL	15.7%	13.1%	15.5%	15.6%	13.3%	12.1%	14.0%	16.0%	9.5%	17.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	23.9%	24.1%	22.4%	27.1%	23.9%	20.2%	24.4%	21.6%	25.5%	23.0%
3	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
OFTEN	43.3%	40.7%	37.1%	41.7%	44.4%	34.3%	42.8%	36.0%	36.5%	42.0%
VERY OFTEN	17.2%	22.1%	24.1%	15.6%	17.8%	33.3%	18.8%	25.6%	27.7%	17.5%
Q3 3.COMMUNITY NEWSLE										
NOT AT ALL	26.9%	20.7%	12.1%	18.8%	24.4%	13.1%	21.8%	16.8%	12.4%	24.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.4%	24.8%	32.8%	32.3%	30.6%	22.2%	31.4%	20.8%	21.2%	32.3%
OFTEN	32.8%	38.6%	36.2%	34.4%	31.7%	45.5%	32.8%	44.0%	46.7%	30.4%
VERY OFTEN	11.9%	15.9%	19.0%	14.6%	13.3%	19.2%	14.0%	18.4%	19.7%	12.8%
Q3 4.POSTERS										
NOT AT ALL	23.9%	18.6%	31.9%	19.8%	21.1%	33.3%	24.4%	24.0%	32.8%	19.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	32.8%	32.4%	39.7%	32.3%	35.6%	36.4%	35.8%	33.6%	35.8%	34.2%
3	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.8%	.7%	.4%
OFTEN	34.3%	37.2%	25.0%	33.3%	35.6%	26.3%	32.1%	32.8%	28.5%	35.0%
VERY OFTEN	9.0%	11.7%	1.7%	14.6%	7.2%	4.0%	7.4%	8.8%	2.2%	10.9%
Q3 4.POSTERS										
NOT AT ALL	23.9%	18.6%	31.9%	19.8%	21.1%	33.3%	24.4%	24.0%	32.8%	19.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	32.8%	32.4%	39.7%	32.3%	35.6%	36.4%	35.8%	33.6%	35.8%	34.2%
3	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.8%	.7%	.4%
OFTEN	34.3%	37.2%	25.0%	33.3%	35.6%	26.3%	32.1%	32.8%	28.5%	35.0%
VERY OFTEN	9.0%	11.7%	1.7%	14.6%	7.2%	4.0%	7.4%	8.8%	2.2%	10.9%
Q3 5.RADIO										
NOT AT ALL	32.1%	31.0%	37.1%	36.5%	28.9%	34.3%	32.8%	34.4%	32.8%	33.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	33.6%	42.8%	32.8%	34.4%	40.0%	34.3%	37.6%	35.2%	36.5%	37.4%
3	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
OFTEN	24.6%	20.7%	22.4%	21.9%	23.9%	24.2%	23.2%	20.0%	24.8%	21.0%
VERY OFTEN	9.7%	5.5%	6.9%	7.3%	6.7%	7.1%	6.3%	9.6%	5.1%	8.2%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q3 6.TV										
NOT AT ALL	34.3%	26.9%	24.1%	29.2%	25.6%	36.4%	29.9%	24.8%	30.7%	27.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	38.8%	37.9%	35.3%	33.3%	38.3%	38.4%	38.0%	37.6%	43.1%	35.0%
OFTEN	16.4%	28.3%	24.1%	24.0%	25.6%	17.2%	21.8%	25.6%	17.5%	26.1%
VERY OFTEN	10.4%	6.9%	16.4%	13.5%	10.6%	8.1%	10.3%	12.0%	8.8%	11.7%
Q3 7.FAMILY MEMBERS										
NOT AT ALL	48.5%	53.8%	62.1%	56.3%	56.7%	46.5%	61.6%	40.8%	50.4%	56.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	20.9%	20.0%	20.7%	20.8%	20.6%	22.2%	17.7%	25.6%	21.2%	20.2%
DK	.0%	.7%	.9%	1.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%	.8%	.7%	.4%
OFTEN	24.6%	21.4%	12.9%	16.7%	19.4%	25.3%	15.9%	28.0%	24.1%	17.9%
VERY OFTEN	6.0%	4.1%	3.4%	5.2%	3.3%	5.1%	4.4%	4.8%	3.6%	4.7%
Q3 8.FRIENDS/NEIGHBOR										
NOT AT ALL	19.4%	16.6%	22.4%	13.5%	23.9%	15.2%	20.7%	16.0%	19.7%	18.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.6%	30.3%	34.5%	39.6%	28.9%	27.3%	31.7%	28.8%	23.4%	35.4%
DK	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
OFTEN	39.6%	37.2%	31.0%	36.5%	35.0%	38.4%	34.3%	40.0%	38.7%	35.0%
VERY OFTEN	13.4%	15.2%	12.1%	10.4%	12.2%	18.2%	13.3%	14.4%	17.5%	11.3%
Q3 9.PEOPLE AT WORK/S										
NOT AT ALL	37.3%	38.6%	65.5%	42.7%	48.3%	44.4%	49.8%	36.8%	45.3%	45.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.4%	32.4%	19.8%	30.2%	21.7%	34.3%	26.2%	29.6%	30.7%	25.7%
DK	.0%	.7%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.4%
OFTEN	26.9%	23.4%	8.6%	20.8%	23.3%	14.1%	18.1%	26.4%	17.5%	22.2%
VERY OFTEN	7.5%	4.8%	6.0%	5.2%	6.7%	7.1%	5.9%	6.4%	6.6%	5.8%
Q3 10.POLITICIANS/PUBL										
NOT AT ALL	53.0%	40.7%	30.2%	43.8%	46.7%	32.3%	41.3%	41.6%	30.7%	47.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	35.1%	37.9%	44.0%	41.7%	34.4%	43.4%	38.7%	39.2%	41.6%	37.4%
DK	.0%	.7%	1.7%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.7%	.8%	.7%	.8%
OFTEN	8.2%	16.6%	18.1%	10.4%	13.9%	18.2%	14.0%	15.2%	21.9%	10.5%
VERY OFTEN	3.7%	4.1%	6.0%	4.2%	3.9%	6.1%	5.2%	3.2%	5.1%	3.9%
LEARN COMMUNITY EVENTS										
OFTEN FROM OTHER										
SOURCE										
99	87.3%	75.9%	83.6%	86.5%	82.2%	77.8%	79.7%	87.2%	82.5%	82.1%
ads from	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
an old t	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
bulletin	.0%	.0%	2.6%	2.1%	.0%	1.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.5%	.4%
church	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.4%
city pla	.0%	.7%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.7%	.0%
coffee s	.7%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.7%	.4%
communit	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
Democrat	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
email	1.5%	1.4%	1.7%	1.0%	2.2%	1.0%	1.8%	.8%	.7%	1.9%
farmer's	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
flyer at	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.4%
flyers	.0%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.6%	3.0%	1.1%	.8%	.7%	1.2%
flyers a	.7%	1.4%	.0%	1.0%	.6%	1.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.5%	.4%
flyers i	.0%	1.4%	.9%	2.1%	.6%	.0%	.7%	.8%	.0%	1.2%
flyers o	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
flyers;	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.4%
general	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%
internet	4.5%	6.2%	6.9%	2.1%	6.7%	7.1%	7.0%	3.2%	6.6%	5.4%
letters	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
local bu	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%	.0%	.7%	.0%
magazine	.0%	.0%	.9%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.4%
mail	.7%	.7%	.0%	1.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.8%	.0%	.8%
mailers	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
mailing	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
pamphlet	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Parentin	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%
posters	.7%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.8%
real est	.0%	.0%	.9%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.7%	.0%
street f	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
while dr	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.4%	.0%	.7%	.0%
witnessi	.7%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
word of	.0%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.8%	.7%	.0%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %

Q14 1.PROGRAMS: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE										
DISAGREE STR	5.2%	16.6%	11.2%	11.5%	8.9%	15.2%	8.5%	16.0%	10.9%	10.9%
DISAGREE	41.0%	41.4%	34.5%	40.6%	33.9%	47.5%	40.6%	36.8%	40.9%	38.1%
NEUTRAL	7.5%	8.3%	13.8%	7.3%	11.7%	8.1%	11.1%	7.2%	10.2%	9.7%
AGREE	37.3%	20.0%	24.1%	26.0%	33.3%	16.2%	28.8%	23.2%	22.6%	30.0%
AGREE STR	9.0%	13.8%	16.4%	14.6%	12.2%	13.1%	11.1%	16.8%	15.3%	11.3%

Q14 2.ATTRACT DRUG DEALERS										
DISAGREE STR	10.4%	12.4%	10.3%	9.4%	9.4%	17.2%	10.7%	10.4%	9.5%	11.7%
DISAGREE	31.3%	43.4%	31.0%	37.5%	30.0%	45.5%	37.6%	31.2%	40.1%	33.5%
NEUTRAL	9.0%	8.3%	15.5%	5.2%	10.0%	16.2%	11.4%	9.6%	14.6%	8.9%
AGREE	34.3%	21.4%	29.3%	35.4%	33.3%	14.1%	26.6%	32.8%	24.1%	30.4%
AGREE STR	14.9%	14.5%	13.8%	12.5%	17.2%	7.1%	13.7%	16.0%	11.7%	15.6%

Q14 3.LOWER PROPERTY VALUES										
DISAGREE STR	8.2%	11.7%	13.8%	13.5%	9.4%	12.1%	12.5%	7.2%	10.2%	11.7%
DISAGREE	31.3%	40.7%	27.6%	27.1%	31.7%	47.5%	32.1%	36.8%	30.7%	35.0%
NEUTRAL	10.4%	8.3%	18.1%	9.4%	12.2%	8.1%	11.8%	12.8%	12.4%	11.7%
AGREE	38.1%	30.3%	23.3%	35.4%	35.0%	21.2%	33.2%	27.2%	31.4%	31.1%
AGREE STR	11.9%	9.0%	17.2%	14.6%	11.7%	11.1%	10.3%	16.0%	15.3%	10.5%

Q14 4.REDUCE PUBLIC COSTS OF HIV/AIDS										
DISAGREE STR	27.6%	31.7%	25.9%	28.1%	28.3%	32.3%	29.5%	25.6%	27.7%	28.8%
DISAGREE	44.0%	42.8%	41.4%	40.6%	42.8%	46.5%	42.4%	44.0%	44.5%	41.6%
NEUTRAL	7.5%	5.5%	11.2%	7.3%	8.3%	5.1%	8.5%	6.4%	9.5%	7.4%
AGREE	15.7%	13.8%	13.8%	17.7%	14.4%	10.1%	13.7%	16.8%	13.1%	15.6%
AGREE STR	5.2%	6.2%	7.8%	6.3%	6.1%	6.1%	5.9%	7.2%	5.1%	6.6%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %

Q14 5.REDUCE COMMUNICABLE DISEASE										
DISAGREE STR	31.3%	31.7%	34.5%	29.2%	32.8%	36.4%	33.2%	30.4%	32.1%	32.3%
DISAGREE	47.8%	46.2%	42.2%	44.8%	45.0%	46.5%	46.5%	42.4%	47.4%	44.7%
NEUTRAL	3.0%	2.8%	6.9%	4.2%	5.0%	3.0%	4.4%	4.0%	3.6%	4.3%
AGREE	12.7%	11.7%	12.1%	16.7%	9.4%	11.1%	10.0%	17.6%	12.4%	12.5%
AGREE STR	5.2%	7.6%	4.3%	5.2%	7.8%	3.0%	5.9%	5.6%	4.4%	6.2%

Q14 6.DECREASE CRIME										
DISAGREE STR	6.0%	7.6%	6.9%	7.3%	4.4%	10.1%	7.0%	7.2%	5.8%	7.0%
DISAGREE	26.1%	22.1%	22.4%	28.1%	18.9%	30.3%	22.1%	26.4%	24.1%	23.3%
NEUTRAL	10.4%	17.2%	16.4%	13.5%	13.3%	15.2%	12.5%	19.2%	16.8%	13.6%
AGREE	44.0%	41.4%	38.8%	40.6%	47.8%	35.4%	45.0%	33.6%	40.1%	42.8%
AGREE STR	13.4%	11.7%	15.5%	10.4%	15.6%	9.1%	13.3%	13.6%	13.1%	13.2%

Q14 7.INCREASE COMMUNITY CONFLICT										
DISAGREE STR	11.2%	3.4%	4.3%	4.2%	7.8%	6.1%	5.9%	7.2%	5.1%	7.0%
DISAGREE	31.3%	31.0%	22.4%	28.1%	26.7%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	29.2%	28.0%
NEUTRAL	3.7%	6.9%	11.2%	4.2%	7.2%	10.1%	5.9%	9.6%	9.5%	5.8%
AGREE	38.8%	37.9%	44.0%	42.7%	43.3%	32.3%	41.7%	38.4%	38.0%	41.6%
AGREE STR	14.9%	20.7%	18.1%	20.8%	15.0%	18.2%	17.3%	19.2%	18.2%	17.5%

Q14 8.ATTRACT HOMELESS										
DISAGREE STR	6.0%	8.3%	10.3%	9.4%	7.8%	9.1%	8.9%	7.2%	7.3%	8.6%
DISAGREE	37.3%	37.2%	30.2%	27.1%	33.3%	44.4%	38.0%	29.6%	36.5%	34.6%
NEUTRAL	4.5%	4.1%	15.5%	7.3%	9.4%	5.1%	7.7%	7.2%	10.9%	5.8%
AGREE	35.1%	35.9%	31.0%	42.7%	33.3%	28.3%	31.4%	40.8%	31.4%	35.8%
AGREE STR	17.2%	14.5%	12.9%	13.5%	16.1%	13.1%	14.0%	15.2%	13.9%	15.2%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A_1.HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM: COMMUNITY MEETINGS										
NOT AT ALL	65.9%	65.0%	66.7%	75.6%	61.0%	67.8%	65.8%	65.6%	59.3%	71.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	31.7%	20.0%	17.5%	22.0%	27.3%	13.6%	20.0%	25.0%	19.8%	22.2%
OFTEN	.0%	10.0%	14.3%	2.4%	10.4%	10.2%	11.7%	4.7%	15.1%	5.1%
VERY OFTEN	2.4%	5.0%	1.6%	.0%	1.3%	8.5%	2.5%	4.7%	5.8%	1.0%
Q15A_2.NEWSPAPERS										
NOT AT ALL	34.1%	33.8%	23.8%	39.0%	26.0%	30.5%	29.2%	31.3%	25.3%	34.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	34.1%	35.0%	36.5%	39.0%	37.7%	28.8%	38.3%	31.3%	31.0%	39.8%
OFTEN	17.1%	23.8%	23.8%	12.2%	23.4%	27.1%	19.2%	29.7%	31.0%	14.3%
VERY OFTEN	14.6%	7.5%	15.9%	9.8%	13.0%	13.6%	13.3%	7.8%	12.6%	11.2%
Q15A_3.COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER										
NOT AT ALL	31.7%	36.3%	38.1%	47.5%	35.9%	27.1%	37.5%	31.3%	32.2%	38.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	22.0%	36.3%	27.0%	30.0%	29.5%	33.9%	30.0%	29.7%	27.6%	31.6%
OFTEN	39.0%	21.3%	22.2%	20.0%	21.8%	30.5%	23.3%	31.3%	27.6%	24.5%
VERY OFTEN	7.3%	6.3%	12.7%	2.5%	12.8%	8.5%	9.2%	7.8%	12.6%	5.1%
Q15A_4.POSTERS										
NOT AT ALL	51.2%	75.0%	79.4%	65.9%	67.5%	76.3%	72.5%	68.8%	75.9%	67.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	36.6%	20.0%	12.7%	26.8%	22.1%	18.6%	18.3%	26.6%	17.2%	24.5%
OFTEN	12.2%	5.0%	6.3%	7.3%	9.1%	5.1%	9.2%	3.1%	5.7%	8.2%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	1.1%	.0%
Q15A_5.RADIO										
NOT AT ALL	61.0%	67.5%	63.5%	70.7%	62.3%	62.7%	66.1%	60.3%	68.6%	60.6%
NOT VERY OFTEN	22.0%	21.3%	28.6%	22.0%	24.7%	23.7%	24.0%	25.4%	19.8%	28.3%
OFTEN	12.2%	11.3%	7.9%	7.3%	11.7%	11.9%	8.3%	14.3%	11.6%	9.1%
VERY OFTEN	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	1.7%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	2.0%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A_6.TV										
NOT AT ALL	53.7%	42.5%	43.5%	41.5%	42.1%	50.8%	43.3%	49.2%	48.8%	43.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	29.3%	42.5%	40.3%	46.3%	35.5%	37.3%	41.7%	33.3%	34.9%	40.8%
OFTEN	9.8%	13.8%	12.9%	9.8%	17.1%	10.2%	12.5%	12.7%	15.1%	10.2%
VERY OFTEN	7.3%	1.3%	3.2%	2.4%	5.3%	1.7%	2.5%	4.8%	1.2%	5.1%
Q15A_7.FAMILY MEMBERS										
NOT AT ALL	68.3%	72.2%	79.0%	77.5%	76.3%	66.1%	81.7%	58.1%	67.1%	79.6%
NOT VERY OFTEN	19.5%	20.3%	8.1%	12.5%	14.5%	20.3%	9.2%	29.0%	17.6%	14.3%
OFTEN	4.9%	3.8%	6.5%	5.0%	5.3%	5.1%	4.2%	6.5%	7.1%	3.1%
VERY OFTEN	7.3%	3.8%	6.5%	5.0%	3.9%	8.5%	5.0%	6.5%	8.2%	3.1%
Q15A_8.FRIENDS/NEIGHBORS										
NOT AT ALL	46.3%	38.8%	43.8%	51.2%	46.2%	30.5%	44.6%	35.9%	32.2%	50.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.1%	28.7%	26.6%	17.1%	24.4%	32.2%	24.0%	28.1%	29.9%	21.2%
OFTEN	26.8%	20.0%	20.3%	22.0%	23.1%	18.6%	23.1%	20.3%	20.7%	23.2%
VERY OFTEN	9.8%	12.5%	9.4%	9.8%	6.4%	18.6%	8.3%	15.6%	17.2%	5.1%
Q15A_9.PEOPLE AT WORK/SCHOOL										
NOT AT ALL	48.8%	70.0%	76.2%	73.2%	61.0%	69.5%	68.3%	64.1%	62.8%	70.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	26.8%	13.8%	11.1%	7.3%	20.8%	16.9%	15.8%	15.6%	19.8%	12.1%
OFTEN	14.6%	13.8%	6.3%	12.2%	10.4%	11.9%	10.0%	15.6%	10.5%	13.1%
VERY OFTEN	9.8%	2.5%	6.3%	7.3%	7.8%	1.7%	5.8%	4.7%	7.0%	4.0%
Q15A_10.POLITICIANS/PUBLIC										
NOT AT ALL	39.0%	43.8%	41.3%	65.9%	36.4%	32.2%	39.2%	46.9%	31.4%	51.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	39.0%	35.0%	39.7%	24.4%	46.8%	35.6%	38.3%	34.4%	39.5%	34.3%
OFTEN	19.5%	12.5%	11.1%	7.3%	11.7%	18.6%	13.3%	15.6%	17.4%	11.1%
VERY OFTEN	2.4%	8.8%	7.9%	2.4%	5.2%	13.6%	9.2%	3.1%	11.6%	3.0%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27_1.CONSEQUENCES: INCREASE NUMBER NEEDLES										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	13.4%	26.2%	13.8%	14.6%	17.8%	23.2%	17.3%	19.2%	19.0%	17.1%
NOT VERY LIKELY	46.3%	36.6%	39.7%	35.4%	42.2%	43.4%	42.8%	36.0%	41.6%	40.5%
DK	3.0%	4.8%	11.2%	9.4%	3.3%	8.1%	6.3%	6.4%	6.6%	6.2%
LIKELY	17.9%	15.2%	14.7%	15.6%	17.2%	13.1%	16.6%	16.0%	16.1%	16.3%
VERY LIKELY	19.4%	17.2%	20.7%	25.0%	19.4%	12.1%	17.0%	22.4%	16.8%	19.8%
Q27_2.DECREASE INJECTION DRUG USE										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	20.1%	17.2%	17.2%	18.8%	18.9%	16.2%	17.7%	19.2%	16.1%	18.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	37.3%	40.0%	37.9%	33.3%	39.4%	43.4%	39.9%	34.4%	43.1%	36.6%
DK	.7%	4.8%	13.8%	6.3%	6.1%	5.1%	6.3%	5.6%	9.5%	4.3%
LIKELY	29.1%	25.5%	20.7%	24.0%	25.0%	26.3%	25.5%	26.4%	24.1%	26.5%
VERY LIKELY	12.7%	12.4%	10.3%	17.7%	10.6%	9.1%	10.7%	14.4%	7.3%	14.4%
Q27_3.THREATEN SAFETY OF CHILDREN										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	17.2%	24.1%	10.3%	14.6%	19.4%	18.2%	19.6%	13.6%	16.1%	18.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	32.8%	39.3%	39.7%	28.1%	36.7%	50.5%	38.4%	35.2%	40.9%	35.4%
DK	7.5%	5.5%	11.2%	10.4%	6.7%	8.1%	7.0%	10.4%	10.2%	7.0%
LIKELY	23.9%	17.9%	19.8%	24.0%	21.7%	15.2%	21.0%	18.4%	19.0%	21.4%
VERY LIKELY	18.7%	13.1%	19.0%	22.9%	15.6%	8.1%	14.0%	22.4%	13.9%	17.9%
Q27_4.ATTRACT CRIME										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	10.4%	15.2%	5.2%	8.3%	11.7%	11.1%	10.7%	10.4%	8.0%	11.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	42.5%	44.8%	37.1%	41.7%	39.4%	50.5%	44.3%	36.8%	43.8%	41.2%
DK	4.5%	7.6%	15.5%	8.3%	6.1%	11.1%	9.2%	8.0%	9.5%	8.6%
LIKELY	28.4%	20.7%	24.1%	24.0%	28.3%	16.2%	23.2%	26.4%	23.4%	25.3%
VERY LIKELY	14.2%	11.7%	18.1%	17.7%	14.4%	11.1%	12.5%	18.4%	15.3%	13.6%
Q27_5.BRING COMMUNITY TOGETHER										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	9.7%	6.2%	6.9%	6.3%	8.9%	7.1%	7.0%	9.6%	6.6%	8.2%
NOT VERY LIKELY	27.6%	31.7%	28.4%	20.8%	31.1%	34.3%	29.9%	28.0%	32.1%	27.6%
DK	5.2%	4.8%	9.5%	9.4%	5.0%	5.1%	5.9%	7.2%	8.0%	5.4%
LIKELY	38.1%	37.9%	38.8%	40.6%	35.0%	39.4%	39.5%	35.2%	38.7%	38.1%
VERY LIKELY	19.4%	19.3%	16.4%	22.9%	20.0%	14.1%	17.7%	20.0%	14.6%	20.6%
Q27_6.LEAD USERS TO SEEK ADDICTION HELP										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	11.2%	7.6%	5.2%	5.2%	9.4%	6.1%	6.3%	11.2%	5.8%	8.9%
NOT VERY LIKELY	20.9%	22.8%	21.6%	18.8%	25.0%	21.2%	22.9%	20.0%	20.4%	22.2%
DK	6.7%	9.7%	13.8%	10.4%	8.3%	9.1%	8.9%	12.8%	10.9%	9.7%
LIKELY	33.6%	38.6%	37.9%	34.4%	33.9%	45.5%	39.5%	31.2%	43.8%	33.1%
VERY LIKELY	27.6%	21.4%	21.6%	31.3%	23.3%	18.2%	22.5%	24.8%	19.0%	26.1%
Q27_7.LEAD USERS TO SEEK HIV/AIDS HELP										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	6.0%	6.2%	6.9%	5.2%	7.2%	5.1%	5.9%	7.2%	5.1%	6.6%
NOT VERY LIKELY	14.2%	17.2%	21.6%	15.6%	18.3%	18.2%	18.1%	16.0%	18.2%	17.1%
DK	6.7%	8.3%	14.7%	11.5%	9.4%	8.1%	10.0%	9.6%	13.1%	7.8%
LIKELY	40.3%	44.1%	36.2%	34.4%	40.6%	45.5%	40.6%	39.2%	42.3%	39.7%
VERY LIKELY	32.8%	24.1%	20.7%	33.3%	24.4%	23.2%	25.5%	28.0%	21.2%	28.8%
Q27_8.INCREASE ADDICTION IN AREA										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	16.4%	28.3%	15.5%	13.5%	23.9%	22.2%	22.5%	16.0%	19.7%	20.2%
NOT VERY LIKELY	37.3%	40.7%	44.0%	37.5%	36.7%	55.6%	40.2%	40.8%	46.7%	37.7%
DK	4.5%	7.6%	15.5%	11.5%	7.8%	7.1%	9.6%	7.2%	10.9%	7.8%
LIKELY	21.6%	14.5%	12.1%	20.8%	17.2%	7.1%	16.2%	16.8%	13.9%	17.9%
VERY LIKELY	20.1%	9.0%	12.9%	16.7%	14.4%	8.1%	11.4%	19.2%	8.8%	16.3%
Q27_9.REDUCE SPREAD HIV/AIDS IN AREA										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	4.5%	2.8%	6.0%	3.1%	3.9%	6.1%	3.7%	5.6%	5.1%	4.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	11.9%	13.8%	15.5%	11.5%	16.1%	11.1%	14.4%	12.0%	13.1%	13.6%
DK	2.2%	2.8%	11.2%	5.2%	2.2%	7.1%	5.2%	4.8%	6.6%	4.3%
LIKELY	39.6%	37.9%	27.6%	35.4%	36.1%	36.4%	33.9%	39.2%	34.3%	36.2%
VERY LIKELY	41.8%	42.8%	39.7%	44.8%	41.7%	39.4%	42.8%	38.4%	40.9%	41.6%
Q27_10.REDUCE SPREAD HEP C IN AREA										
NOT AT ALL LKLY	3.0%	5.5%	4.3%	3.1%	5.6%	3.0%	4.8%	3.2%	2.9%	5.1%
NOT VERY LIKELY	12.7%	12.4%	14.7%	11.5%	14.4%	13.1%	13.3%	12.8%	16.1%	11.7%
DK	2.2%	4.1%	10.3%	5.2%	3.9%	5.1%	6.3%	3.2%	6.6%	4.7%
LIKELY	31.3%	31.0%	34.5%	31.3%	33.3%	30.3%	32.5%	32.0%	31.4%	32.7%
VERY LIKELY	50.7%	46.9%	36.2%	49.0%	42.8%	48.5%	43.2%	48.8%	43.1%	45.9%

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME		
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT	
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
Q28_1.PROGRAM: IN NORTH PARK BECAUSE USERS ARE THERE											
NO	64.2%	62.1%	74.1%	65.6%	66.7%	62.6%	64.2%	70.4%	65.0%	67.3%	
TRUE	35.8%	37.9%	25.9%	34.4%	33.3%	37.4%	35.8%	29.6%	35.0%	32.7%	
Q28_2.PARENTS AFRAID LET KIDS PLAY OUTSIDE											
NO	61.9%	82.8%	80.2%	60.4%	75.0%	87.9%	77.5%	68.8%	81.0%	71.6%	
TRUE	38.1%	17.2%	19.8%	39.6%	25.0%	12.1%	22.5%	31.2%	19.0%	28.4%	
Q28_3.OFFICIALS DON'T LISTEN TO CITIZENS											
NO	79.9%	79.3%	81.0%	79.2%	79.4%	83.8%	78.6%	82.4%	77.4%	81.7%	
TRUE	20.1%	20.7%	19.0%	20.8%	20.6%	16.2%	21.4%	17.6%	22.6%	18.3%	
Q28_4.CITIZENS NOT INTERESTED PROVIDING INPUT											
NO	70.1%	65.5%	67.2%	72.9%	66.7%	65.7%	63.5%	76.0%	65.0%	69.6%	
TRUE	29.9%	34.5%	32.8%	27.1%	33.3%	34.3%	36.5%	24.0%	35.0%	30.4%	
Q28_5.REASON PEOPLE WON'T LIVE IN NORTH PARK											
NO	84.3%	93.1%	94.0%	90.6%	88.9%	93.9%	90.8%	89.6%	94.2%	88.7%	
TRUE	15.7%	6.9%	6.0%	9.4%	11.1%	6.1%	9.2%	10.4%	5.8%	11.3%	

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME		
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT	
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
Q28_6.DISTRIBUTED NEEDLES ARE MONITORED											
NO	59.7%	52.4%	62.1%	55.2%	57.8%	55.6%	54.6%	64.0%	56.9%	58.8%	
TRUE	40.3%	47.6%	37.9%	44.8%	42.2%	44.4%	45.4%	36.0%	43.1%	41.2%	
Q28_7.PROVIDED IMMEDIATE REFERRALS											
NO	73.9%	68.3%	76.7%	67.7%	76.7%	69.7%	72.3%	74.4%	70.8%	74.3%	
TRUE	26.1%	31.7%	23.3%	32.3%	23.3%	30.3%	27.7%	25.6%	29.2%	25.7%	
Q28_8.CITY NOTIFIED CITIZENS DURING PLANNING											
NO	84.3%	81.4%	90.5%	85.4%	86.1%	82.8%	85.6%	82.4%	80.3%	87.2%	
TRUE	15.7%	18.6%	9.5%	14.6%	13.9%	17.2%	14.4%	17.6%	19.7%	12.8%	
Q28_9.CITIZENS HAVE INFLUENCE OVER OPERATION											
NO	48.5%	40.0%	46.6%	43.8%	48.3%	37.4%	43.5%	48.0%	44.5%	45.1%	
TRUE	51.5%	60.0%	53.4%	56.3%	51.7%	62.6%	56.5%	52.0%	55.5%	54.9%	
Q28_10.RESIDENTS COULD PARTICIPATE IMPLEMENTATION											
NO	77.6%	68.3%	72.4%	69.8%	74.4%	69.7%	72.3%	72.8%	67.9%	75.5%	
TRUE	22.4%	31.7%	27.6%	30.2%	25.6%	30.3%	27.7%	27.2%	32.1%	24.5%	

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME		
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT	
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
Q28_11.I HEARD ABOUT PUBLIC FORUM ON PROGRAM											
NO	85.8%	79.3%	88.8%	88.5%	84.4%	79.8%	84.9%	83.2%	79.6%	87.2%	
TRUE	14.2%	20.7%	11.2%	11.5%	15.6%	20.2%	15.1%	16.8%	20.4%	12.8%	
Q28_12.MOST CITIZENS KNOW LITTLE ABOUT PROGRAM											
NO	18.7%	20.7%	19.0%	26.0%	15.6%	20.2%	18.5%	21.6%	19.0%	19.8%	
TRUE	81.3%	79.3%	81.0%	74.0%	84.4%	79.8%	81.5%	78.4%	81.0%	80.2%	
Q28_13.BUSINESSES PAID SO WON'T OPPOSE											
NO	91.8%	94.5%	95.7%	94.8%	92.8%	93.9%	93.4%	94.4%	92.7%	94.2%	
TRUE	8.2%	5.5%	4.3%	5.2%	7.2%	6.1%	6.6%	5.6%	7.3%	5.8%	
Q28_14.CITY COUNCIL SHOWN RESPECT FOR CITIZENS											
NO	69.4%	75.2%	75.9%	66.7%	77.2%	70.7%	74.2%	72.0%	73.0%	73.2%	
TRUE	30.6%	24.8%	24.1%	33.3%	22.8%	29.3%	25.8%	28.0%	27.0%	26.8%	
Q28_15.WEALTHIER NEIGHBORHOODS DID NOT WANT											
NO	64.9%	60.7%	56.0%	66.7%	60.0%	58.6%	61.6%	59.2%	59.1%	62.3%	
TRUE	35.1%	39.3%	44.0%	33.3%	40.0%	41.4%	38.4%	40.8%	40.9%	37.7%	
Q28_16.POLICE RESPONSE ADEQUATE TO NP											
NO	68.7%	69.0%	76.7%	66.7%	74.4%	68.7%	70.5%	72.8%	71.5%	70.8%	
TRUE	31.3%	31.0%	23.3%	33.3%	25.6%	31.3%	29.5%	27.2%	28.5%	29.2%	

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME		
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT	
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
Q33_1.SUPPORT LOCATION: MEDICAL BUILDING											
NO	18.7%	14.5%	19.8%	19.8%	18.3%	12.1%	15.5%	23.2%	16.1%	17.9%	
YES	81.3%	85.5%	80.2%	80.2%	81.7%	87.9%	84.5%	76.8%	83.9%	82.1%	
Q33_2.PERMANENT BUILDING											
NO	22.4%	22.1%	28.4%	24.0%	23.3%	22.2%	21.8%	30.4%	27.7%	22.2%	
YES	77.6%	77.9%	71.6%	76.0%	76.7%	77.8%	78.2%	69.6%	72.3%	77.8%	
Q33_3.AWAY FROM SCHOOLS											
NO	19.4%	16.6%	25.0%	19.8%	21.7%	14.1%	18.5%	23.2%	19.7%	19.8%	
YES	80.6%	83.4%	75.0%	80.2%	78.3%	85.9%	81.5%	76.8%	80.3%	80.2%	
Q33_4.AWAY FROM HOMES											
NO	21.6%	20.7%	25.9%	21.9%	23.3%	19.2%	20.3%	27.2%	21.2%	23.0%	
YES	78.4%	79.3%	74.1%	78.1%	76.7%	80.8%	79.7%	72.8%	78.8%	77.0%	
Q33_5.ON OWN BLOCK											
NO	57.5%	56.6%	73.3%	61.5%	60.6%	62.6%	57.9%	70.4%	67.9%	58.4%	
YES	42.5%	43.4%	26.7%	38.5%	39.4%	37.4%	42.1%	29.6%	32.1%	41.6%	
Q33_6.FAR FROM HOME											
NO	23.9%	29.0%	37.9%	28.1%	30.6%	27.3%	29.9%	30.4%	30.7%	29.2%	
YES	76.1%	71.0%	62.1%	71.9%	69.4%	72.7%	70.1%	69.6%	69.3%	70.8%	
Q33_7.NEXT DOOR/ACROSS STREET											
NO	74.6%	66.9%	77.6%	72.9%	73.3%	69.7%	68.3%	82.4%	79.6%	68.9%	
YES	25.4%	33.1%	22.4%	27.1%	26.7%	30.3%	31.7%	17.6%	20.4%	31.1%	
Q33_8.LOCATED OUTSIDE NORTH PARK											
NO	29.9%	31.0%	38.8%	26.0%	37.8%	28.3%	33.9%	31.2%	30.7%	33.5%	
YES	70.1%	69.0%	61.2%	74.0%	62.2%	71.7%	66.1%	68.8%	69.3%	66.5%	

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q34 1.POL PARTICIPATION-VOTE FOR PRESIDENT										
NOT AT ALL	28.4%	14.7%	7.8%	24.2%	19.6%	5.1%	17.1%	19.5%	9.5%	22.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	3.0%	3.5%	.9%	4.2%	1.1%	3.1%	2.6%	2.4%	2.2%	2.8%
OFTEN	20.9%	18.2%	20.0%	25.3%	22.9%	10.2%	23.0%	12.2%	13.1%	23.2%
VERY OFTEN	47.8%	63.6%	71.3%	46.3%	56.4%	81.6%	57.2%	65.9%	75.2%	52.0%
Q34 2.VOTE FOR CITY COUNCIL										
NOT AT ALL	38.8%	16.8%	8.6%	32.3%	22.3%	10.2%	20.7%	25.2%	10.9%	27.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	11.9%	11.2%	5.2%	12.5%	10.6%	6.1%	10.0%	8.1%	2.9%	13.3%
OFTEN	20.9%	25.2%	27.6%	21.9%	25.7%	24.5%	27.8%	17.9%	27.7%	22.7%
VERY OFTEN	28.4%	46.9%	58.6%	33.3%	41.3%	59.2%	41.5%	48.8%	58.4%	36.1%
Q34 3.VOTE IN PRIMARIES										
NOT AT ALL	32.1%	14.0%	6.9%	28.1%	17.9%	7.1%	18.1%	19.5%	8.8%	23.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	7.5%	7.0%	.9%	8.3%	6.1%	2.0%	5.6%	4.9%	2.9%	6.7%
OFTEN	20.1%	25.2%	22.4%	22.9%	25.1%	18.4%	24.1%	19.5%	19.7%	24.3%
VERY OFTEN	40.3%	53.8%	69.8%	40.6%	50.8%	72.4%	52.2%	56.1%	68.6%	45.5%
Q34 4.CONTACT COUNCILMEN										
NOT AT ALL	67.2%	45.8%	48.3%	72.9%	52.0%	38.4%	55.4%	51.2%	37.2%	62.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	22.4%	32.6%	28.4%	19.8%	29.1%	33.3%	28.0%	26.8%	32.8%	25.4%
OFTEN	7.5%	16.7%	13.8%	4.2%	12.3%	23.2%	11.4%	16.3%	22.6%	7.8%
VERY OFTEN	3.0%	4.9%	9.5%	3.1%	6.7%	5.1%	5.2%	5.7%	7.3%	4.3%
Q34 5.ATTEND NEIGHBORHOOD MTGS										
NOT AT ALL	62.7%	45.8%	42.2%	60.4%	50.8%	39.4%	52.4%	47.2%	35.0%	58.6%
NOT VERY OFTEN	26.1%	36.1%	32.8%	27.1%	31.8%	36.4%	31.0%	32.5%	35.8%	29.3%
OFTEN	10.4%	15.3%	19.0%	10.4%	15.1%	18.2%	14.0%	17.1%	21.9%	11.3%
VERY OFTEN	.7%	2.8%	6.0%	2.1%	2.2%	6.1%	2.6%	3.3%	7.3%	.8%
Q34 6.TALK OTHERS ABOUT ISSUES										
NOT AT ALL	32.8%	20.8%	14.7%	35.4%	24.6%	6.1%	22.5%	26.0%	12.4%	28.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	22.4%	28.5%	30.2%	28.1%	26.3%	27.3%	26.9%	26.8%	27.7%	26.6%
OFTEN	29.9%	31.3%	32.8%	22.9%	33.0%	38.4%	32.5%	27.6%	35.8%	29.3%
VERY OFTEN	14.9%	19.4%	22.4%	13.5%	16.2%	28.3%	18.1%	19.5%	24.1%	15.2%
Q34 7.ROLE IN COUNCIL CAMPAIGN										
NOT AT ALL	78.4%	66.0%	60.3%	82.3%	65.4%	59.6%	70.1%	65.9%	59.9%	73.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	14.2%	27.1%	21.6%	11.5%	25.7%	23.2%	19.9%	22.8%	24.8%	18.8%
OFTEN	3.0%	6.3%	7.8%	1.0%	5.6%	10.1%	5.2%	7.3%	10.2%	3.5%
VERY OFTEN	4.5%	.7%	10.3%	5.2%	3.4%	7.1%	4.8%	4.1%	5.1%	4.7%
Q34 8.GIVE MONEY COUNCIL CAMPAIGN										
NOT AT ALL	79.1%	69.2%	68.7%	80.2%	71.8%	65.7%	73.2%	70.7%	64.7%	76.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	13.4%	23.8%	20.9%	15.6%	17.5%	25.3%	19.0%	20.3%	22.1%	18.0%
OFTEN	6.0%	4.9%	7.8%	3.1%	9.6%	4.0%	5.9%	7.3%	8.8%	5.1%
VERY OFTEN	1.5%	2.1%	2.6%	1.0%	1.1%	5.1%	1.9%	1.6%	4.4%	.8%
Q34 9.WRITE LETTER TO NEWSPAPER										
NOT AT ALL	68.7%	57.6%	60.3%	69.8%	62.6%	51.5%	63.1%	61.0%	57.7%	64.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	24.6%	31.9%	31.9%	24.0%	27.9%	39.4%	26.9%	34.1%	32.1%	27.7%
OFTEN	6.7%	6.9%	4.3%	5.2%	7.3%	6.1%	8.1%	2.4%	6.6%	6.3%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	3.5%	3.4%	1.0%	2.2%	3.0%	1.8%	2.4%	3.6%	1.6%
Q34 10.ATTEND COUNCIL MTGS										
NOT AT ALL	73.9%	63.2%	59.5%	71.9%	64.2%	59.6%	66.1%	65.9%	60.6%	68.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.2%	32.6%	32.8%	21.9%	29.6%	32.3%	27.7%	26.8%	31.4%	25.8%
OFTEN	6.0%	3.5%	6.9%	4.2%	4.5%	7.1%	4.8%	5.7%	7.3%	4.3%
VERY OFTEN	3.0%	.7%	.9%	2.1%	1.7%	1.0%	1.5%	1.6%	.7%	2.0%
Q34 11.SIGN PETITION										
NOT AT ALL	26.9%	14.6%	12.1%	32.3%	15.6%	6.1%	17.7%	20.3%	9.5%	22.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	19.4%	25.0%	29.3%	25.0%	23.5%	25.3%	23.2%	26.8%	27.7%	22.7%
OFTEN	33.6%	39.6%	40.5%	29.2%	36.3%	49.5%	38.7%	35.0%	43.1%	35.2%
VERY OFTEN	20.1%	20.8%	18.1%	13.5%	24.6%	19.2%	20.3%	17.9%	19.7%	19.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %

Q13.APPROVE NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS												
DISAPPR STR	17.6%	9.3%	7.3%	8.9%	15.5%	8.9%	12.5%	15.5%	.0%	6.3%	11.0%	9.5%
DISAPPR	18.7%	12.4%	9.5%	12.3%	13.1%	12.2%	12.5%	13.1%	14.3%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
NEUTRAL	13.2%	10.9%	2.8%	6.0%	14.3%	4.2%	16.7%	14.3%	.0%	15.6%	5.0%	10.5%
APPROVE	22.0%	27.1%	37.4%	29.7%	34.5%	29.5%	20.8%	34.5%	28.6%	34.4%	31.5%	30.0%
APPROVE STR	28.6%	40.3%	43.0%	43.0%	22.6%	45.1%	37.5%	22.6%	57.1%	31.3%	40.0%	37.5%

Q17.APPROVAL OF NORTH PARK PROGRAM												
DISAPPR STR	9.9%	10.9%	7.8%	8.9%	10.7%	8.9%	8.3%	10.7%	.0%	9.4%	9.0%	9.5%
DISAPPR	9.9%	8.5%	8.9%	7.9%	13.1%	7.6%	4.2%	13.1%	.0%	12.5%	8.5%	9.5%
NEUTRAL	33.0%	23.3%	19.0%	23.4%	23.8%	21.1%	37.5%	23.8%	14.3%	28.1%	23.0%	24.0%
APPROVE	31.9%	39.5%	37.4%	36.7%	38.1%	39.2%	16.7%	38.1%	57.1%	28.1%	40.5%	33.5%
APPROVE STR	15.4%	17.8%	26.8%	23.1%	14.3%	23.2%	33.3%	14.3%	28.6%	21.9%	19.0%	23.5%

Q16.EXTENT PILOT PROGRAM AFFECTS ME												
NOT AT ALL	65.9%	60.0%	56.3%	61.8%	52.4%	63.0%	60.9%	52.4%	50.0%	53.3%	57.9%	61.7%
NOT MUCH	8.8%	11.2%	21.6%	15.2%	15.5%	16.2%	13.0%	15.5%	16.7%	10.0%	17.3%	13.3%
SOME	14.3%	21.6%	14.2%	15.2%	21.4%	14.9%	13.0%	21.4%	16.7%	20.0%	16.8%	16.3%
A GREAT DEAL	11.0%	7.2%	8.0%	7.8%	10.7%	6.0%	13.0%	10.7%	16.7%	16.7%	8.1%	8.7%

Q24.PROGRAM EFFECT ON OWN LIFE												
VERY NEG	5.5%	3.9%	2.2%	3.2%	4.8%	3.8%	4.2%	4.8%	.0%	.0%	3.0%	4.0%
SOMEWT NEG	3.3%	4.7%	7.3%	5.4%	6.0%	5.5%	4.2%	6.0%	.0%	6.3%	8.0%	3.0%
NEUTRAL	80.2%	79.1%	80.4%	82.0%	72.6%	81.4%	79.2%	72.6%	85.7%	84.4%	76.0%	84.0%
SOMEWHT POS	6.6%	10.9%	7.8%	7.6%	11.9%	6.8%	12.5%	11.9%	14.3%	9.4%	9.5%	7.5%
VERY POS	4.4%	1.6%	2.2%	1.9%	4.8%	2.5%	.0%	4.8%	.0%	.0%	3.5%	1.5%

Q25.PROGRAM EFFECT ON COMMUNITY												
VERY NEG	7.7%	5.4%	5.0%	5.4%	7.1%	6.3%	.0%	7.1%	.0%	6.3%	6.0%	5.5%
SOMEWT NEG	11.0%	9.3%	12.8%	11.4%	10.7%	10.5%	20.8%	10.7%	28.6%	3.1%	10.5%	12.0%
NEUTRAL	56.0%	45.7%	42.5%	48.1%	41.7%	47.7%	58.3%	41.7%	14.3%	43.8%	45.0%	48.5%
SOMEWHT POS	17.6%	31.0%	30.2%	26.6%	31.0%	26.2%	12.5%	31.0%	42.9%	40.6%	29.5%	25.5%
VERY POS	7.7%	8.5%	9.5%	8.5%	9.5%	9.3%	8.3%	9.5%	14.3%	6.3%	9.0%	8.5%

Q26.EFFECT OF PROGRAM ON NORTH PARK IMAGE												
VERY NEG	6.6%	7.8%	6.7%	7.0%	7.1%	6.8%	4.2%	7.1%	14.3%	9.4%	7.0%	7.0%
SOMEWT NEG	14.3%	19.4%	22.3%	21.8%	10.7%	21.9%	12.5%	10.7%	28.6%	15.6%	20.0%	19.0%
NEUTRAL	47.3%	46.5%	48.0%	47.8%	46.4%	50.6%	54.2%	46.4%	14.3%	37.5%	45.0%	50.0%
SOMEWHT POS	24.2%	18.6%	19.0%	17.1%	31.0%	15.2%	12.5%	31.0%	28.6%	31.3%	20.5%	19.5%
VERY POS	7.7%	7.8%	3.9%	6.3%	4.8%	5.5%	16.7%	4.8%	14.3%	6.3%	7.5%	4.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q2.INTEREST IN NORTH PARK POLITICAL/SOCIAL												
NOT INTERESTED	14.4%	4.7%	3.9%	5.7%	9.5%	4.2%	8.7%	9.5%	28.6%	12.5%	9.0%	4.0%
NOT VERY INTERESTED	31.1%	21.1%	14.0%	16.2%	34.5%	17.4%	13.0%	34.5%	14.3%	12.5%	18.1%	22.1%
INTERESTED	42.2%	52.3%	50.8%	50.6%	44.0%	47.9%	65.2%	44.0%	28.6%	59.4%	47.2%	51.3%
VERY INTERESTED	12.2%	21.9%	31.3%	27.4%	11.9%	30.5%	13.0%	11.9%	28.6%	15.6%	25.6%	22.6%
Q6.POLITICIANS DO WHAT IS IN BEST INTEREST												
STRONGLY DISAGREE	33.3%	27.8%	16.3%	25.2%	19.3%	23.5%	36.4%	19.3%	14.3%	25.8%	26.8%	21.0%
SOMewhat DISAGREE	21.1%	30.2%	34.3%	30.4%	28.9%	29.6%	40.9%	28.9%	14.3%	35.5%	27.8%	32.3%
SOMewhat AGREE	35.6%	37.3%	41.3%	38.2%	39.8%	41.7%	18.2%	39.8%	57.1%	22.6%	38.1%	39.0%
STRONGLY AGREE	10.0%	4.8%	8.1%	6.2%	12.0%	5.2%	4.5%	12.0%	14.3%	16.1%	7.2%	7.7%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK												
NOTHING AT ALL	30.8%	31.8%	22.9%	26.3%	32.1%	24.5%	58.3%	32.1%	42.9%	21.9%	28.5%	26.5%
NOT MUCH	22.0%	22.5%	21.2%	20.6%	27.4%	20.7%	8.3%	27.4%	14.3%	28.1%	25.5%	18.5%
SOME	37.4%	25.6%	35.8%	34.5%	26.2%	33.3%	29.2%	26.2%	42.9%	37.5%	29.5%	36.0%
A GREAT DEAL	9.9%	20.2%	20.1%	18.7%	14.3%	21.5%	4.2%	14.3%	.0%	12.5%	16.5%	19.0%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK												
NOTHING AT ALL	30.8%	31.8%	22.9%	26.3%	32.1%	24.5%	58.3%	32.1%	42.9%	21.9%	28.5%	26.5%
NOT MUCH	22.0%	22.5%	21.2%	20.6%	27.4%	20.7%	8.3%	27.4%	14.3%	28.1%	25.5%	18.5%
SOME	37.4%	25.6%	35.8%	34.5%	26.2%	33.3%	29.2%	26.2%	42.9%	37.5%	29.5%	36.0%
A GREAT DEAL	9.9%	20.2%	20.1%	18.7%	14.3%	21.5%	4.2%	14.3%	.0%	12.5%	16.5%	19.0%
Q9.IV USERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD AFFECT Y												
NOT AT ALL	34.1%	32.3%	35.2%	35.3%	28.9%	35.7%	34.8%	28.9%	14.3%	28.1%	34.5%	33.3%
NOT MUCH	8.8%	20.5%	31.3%	25.6%	12.0%	26.8%	13.0%	12.0%	57.1%	21.9%	24.9%	20.7%
SOME	29.7%	33.9%	21.6%	26.9%	28.9%	27.2%	21.7%	28.9%	.0%	37.5%	27.9%	26.8%
A GREAT DEAL	27.5%	13.4%	11.9%	12.2%	30.1%	10.2%	30.4%	30.1%	28.6%	12.5%	12.7%	19.2%
Q10.ISSUE OF PRESENCE OF ID USERS												
NOT AN ISSUE	8.1%	8.8%	11.8%	9.6%	11.1%	9.7%	19.0%	11.1%	14.3%	.0%	12.4%	7.4%
NOT VERY IMPORTANT	15.1%	16.0%	24.7%	21.3%	14.8%	20.8%	4.8%	14.8%	28.6%	25.0%	27.5%	12.2%
IMPORTANT	34.9%	48.8%	45.9%	47.5%	32.1%	48.7%	38.1%	32.1%	28.6%	56.3%	39.4%	49.2%
VERY IMPORTANT	41.9%	26.4%	17.6%	21.6%	42.0%	20.8%	38.1%	42.0%	28.6%	18.8%	20.7%	31.2%
Q11.CAN INFLUENCE INJECTION DRUG USE												
NOT AT ALL	39.3%	34.1%	28.4%	33.9%	29.3%	34.6%	39.1%	29.3%	50.0%	12.9%	31.7%	34.2%
NOT MUCH	21.3%	26.4%	29.0%	26.8%	24.4%	27.4%	13.0%	24.4%	16.7%	35.5%	27.1%	25.5%
SOME	28.1%	34.1%	36.4%	34.2%	31.7%	34.2%	30.4%	31.7%	33.3%	41.9%	34.2%	33.2%
A GREAT DEAL	11.2%	5.4%	6.3%	5.1%	14.6%	3.8%	17.4%	14.6%	.0%	9.7%	7.0%	7.1%
Q15.AMOUNT HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM IN NORTH PARK												
NOTHING AT ALL	60.4%	54.3%	48.6%	50.9%	61.9%	48.1%	62.5%	61.9%	57.1%	62.5%	54.0%	52.5%
NOT MUCH	17.6%	12.4%	11.2%	12.0%	16.7%	11.8%	25.0%	16.7%	14.3%	6.3%	13.5%	12.5%
SOME	16.5%	25.6%	25.7%	25.6%	15.5%	28.7%	8.3%	15.5%	28.6%	18.8%	23.0%	24.0%
A GREAT DEAL	5.5%	7.8%	14.5%	11.4%	6.0%	11.4%	4.2%	6.0%	.0%	12.5%	9.5%	11.0%
Q18.FAVOR/OPOSE PROGRAM BEING PERMANENT												
STRONGLY OPOSE	17.6%	17.1%	11.7%	14.2%	16.7%	13.9%	16.7%	16.7%	14.3%	9.4%	14.0%	15.5%
OPOSE	2.2%	3.9%	8.4%	6.0%	3.6%	5.5%	.0%	3.6%	.0%	12.5%	5.5%	5.5%
NEUTRAL	33.0%	23.3%	14.5%	19.9%	27.4%	19.0%	29.2%	27.4%	.0%	25.0%	20.5%	22.5%
FAVOR	17.6%	24.0%	27.9%	25.0%	22.6%	26.2%	12.5%	22.6%	42.9%	25.0%	26.0%	23.0%
STRONGLY FAVOR	29.7%	31.8%	37.4%	34.8%	29.8%	35.4%	41.7%	29.8%	42.9%	28.1%	34.0%	33.5%
Q19.ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PERMANENT PROGRAM												
NOT AT ALL	35.2%	27.6%	16.5%	24.9%	21.5%	25.4%	18.2%	21.5%	42.9%	21.9%	25.3%	23.2%
NOT MUCH	20.5%	23.6%	32.4%	27.5%	25.3%	28.0%	18.2%	25.3%	28.6%	31.3%	32.0%	22.2%
SOME	31.8%	43.3%	40.9%	39.9%	38.0%	40.3%	45.5%	38.0%	14.3%	37.5%	34.0%	44.9%
A GREAT DEAL	12.5%	5.5%	10.2%	7.7%	15.2%	6.4%	18.2%	15.2%	14.3%	9.4%	8.8%	9.6%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q20.VIEW OF PROGRAM CHANGED SINCE FEB 2003												
YES	15.6%	11.1%	17.8%	14.8%	18.5%	15.1%	28.6%	18.5%	.0%	8.3%	13.8%	16.9%
NO	84.4%	88.9%	82.2%	85.2%	81.5%	84.9%	71.4%	81.5%	100.0%	91.7%	86.2%	83.1%
Q20A.CURRENT VIEW OF PROGRAM												
MORE POSITIVE	60.0%	66.7%	37.5%	45.5%	60.0%	38.9%	100.0%	60.0%	.0%	100.0%	41.7%	53.3%
MORE NEGATIVE	40.0%	33.3%	50.0%	45.5%	40.0%	50.0%	.0%	40.0%	.0%	.0%	58.3%	33.3%
MORE NEUTRAL	.0%	.0%	12.5%	9.1%	.0%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.3%
Q21A.KNOW PROGRAM MAIN LOCATION												
NO	95.6%	93.0%	82.1%	86.4%	97.6%	86.5%	95.8%	97.6%	71.4%	84.4%	90.0%	87.5%
CORRECT	4.4%	7.0%	17.9%	13.6%	2.4%	13.5%	4.2%	2.4%	28.6%	15.6%	10.0%	12.5%
Q21B.KNOW USE MOBILE VAN												
NO	93.4%	89.9%	79.9%	84.5%	92.9%	84.4%	91.7%	92.9%	85.7%	84.4%	87.5%	85.0%
MOBILE VAN	6.6%	10.1%	20.1%	15.5%	7.1%	15.6%	8.3%	7.1%	14.3%	15.6%	12.5%	15.0%
Q21C.KNOW OTHER SERVICES												
NO	98.9%	89.9%	85.5%	88.0%	97.6%	88.2%	83.3%	97.6%	100.0%	84.4%	91.0%	89.0%
YES	1.1%	10.1%	14.5%	12.0%	2.4%	11.8%	16.7%	2.4%	.0%	15.6%	9.0%	11.0%
Q21E.PROGRAM IS ONE PLACE TO DISPOSE NEEDLES												
NO	45.1%	39.5%	45.8%	45.3%	38.1%	44.3%	45.8%	38.1%	57.1%	37.5%	45.5%	42.0%
TRUE	54.9%	60.5%	54.2%	54.7%	61.9%	55.7%	54.2%	61.9%	42.9%	62.5%	54.5%	58.0%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q22.PERSONALLY INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN												
PLANNING	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%
IMPLEMENTATION	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%
NO/NEITHER	100.0%	99.2%	99.4%	100.0%	97.6%	100.0%	100.0%	97.6%	100.0%	100.0%	99.0%	100.0%
Q22A.WHY NOT INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN												
DIDN'T KNOW	67.1%	59.5%	57.5%	59.1%	64.1%	56.2%	75.0%	64.1%	40.0%	71.0%	60.2%	60.0%
DIDN'T CARE	14.1%	8.7%	12.1%	12.3%	7.7%	15.0%	4.2%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	11.0%	11.8%
WOULDN'T MATTER	1.2%	.8%	2.3%	1.6%	1.3%	1.7%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	2.6%	.5%
TOO BUSY/NO TIME	5.9%	11.1%	12.1%	10.1%	11.5%	8.6%	12.5%	11.5%	60.0%	12.9%	8.9%	11.8%
OTHER	11.8%	19.8%	16.1%	16.9%	15.4%	18.5%	8.3%	15.4%	.0%	16.1%	17.3%	15.9%
Q23.SPOKE ABOUT PROGRAM TO OTHERS INVOLVED												
PLANNING	.0%	1.6%	.6%	.6%	1.2%	.9%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%
IMPLEMENTATION	.0%	1.6%	1.1%	.6%	2.4%	.4%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	3.1%	2.0%	.0%
BOTH	2.2%	2.4%	3.9%	2.5%	4.8%	3.0%	.0%	4.8%	.0%	3.1%	2.5%	3.5%
NO/NEITHER	97.8%	94.5%	94.4%	96.2%	91.6%	95.7%	100.0%	91.6%	100.0%	93.8%	94.0%	96.5%
Q29.SPECIAL INTERESTS HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENC												
DISAGREE STR	7.7%	10.9%	12.3%	10.8%	10.7%	11.0%	16.7%	10.7%	.0%	9.4%	13.0%	8.5%
DISAGREE	24.2%	21.7%	15.1%	16.1%	31.0%	14.8%	12.5%	31.0%	42.9%	18.8%	21.0%	17.5%
NEUTRAL	61.5%	59.7%	54.2%	59.2%	52.4%	59.5%	58.3%	52.4%	57.1%	56.3%	53.0%	62.5%
AGREE	3.3%	4.7%	14.0%	9.5%	4.8%	11.8%	.0%	4.8%	.0%	6.3%	9.0%	8.8%
AGREE STR	3.3%	3.1%	4.5%	4.4%	1.2%	3.0%	12.5%	1.2%	.0%	9.4%	4.0%	3.5%
Q30.CAN TRUST OFFICIALS RUNNING PROGRAM												
DISAGREE STR	8.8%	7.0%	8.4%	8.5%	6.0%	8.0%	25.0%	6.0%	.0%	.0%	9.0%	7.0%
DISAGREE	13.2%	14.7%	10.6%	12.7%	11.9%	13.1%	12.5%	11.9%	14.3%	12.5%	8.0%	17.0%
NEUTRAL	24.2%	25.6%	21.2%	24.7%	19.0%	21.1%	29.2%	19.0%	28.6%	37.5%	25.5%	21.5%
AGREE	42.9%	38.8%	48.0%	41.1%	53.6%	45.1%	16.7%	53.6%	42.9%	34.4%	46.0%	41.5%
AGREE STR	11.0%	14.0%	11.7%	13.0%	9.5%	12.7%	16.7%	9.5%	14.3%	15.6%	11.5%	13.0%
Q31.ATTENDED COMMUNITY MEETINGS ON PROGRAM												
YES	3.3%	2.3%	3.9%	2.9%	4.8%	3.4%	.0%	4.8%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	2.5%
NO	96.7%	97.7%	96.1%	97.1%	95.2%	96.6%	100.0%	95.2%	100.0%	100.0%	96.0%	97.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER		
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
Q31A.MEETINGS PROVIDED MEANINGFUL DISCUSS OF													
YES	100.0%	100.0%	71.4%	77.8%	100.0%	87.5%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	87.5%	80.0%	
NO	.0%	.0%	28.6%	22.2%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	20.0%	
Q32.PUBLIC WAS ASKED ABOUT VIEWS OF PROGRAM													
YES	11.3%	18.1%	33.9%	24.5%	18.3%	25.9%	13.3%	18.3%	25.0%	26.1%	22.6%	23.3%	
NO	88.7%	81.9%	66.1%	75.5%	81.7%	74.1%	86.7%	81.7%	75.0%	73.9%	77.4%	76.7%	
PARTY													
REPUBLICAN	17.3%	17.4%	13.3%	16.5%	10.0%	17.0%	15.8%	10.0%	.0%	19.0%	17.1%	13.6%	
INDEP	44.2%	31.5%	24.5%	30.4%	30.0%	30.3%	15.8%	30.0%	25.0%	38.1%	35.0%	25.9%	
DEMOCRAT	38.5%	51.1%	62.2%	53.2%	60.0%	52.7%	68.4%	60.0%	75.0%	42.9%	47.9%	60.5%	

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER		
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	
IDEOLOGY													
CONSERVATIVE	34.9%	14.1%	11.4%	15.5%	24.7%	14.0%	30.4%	24.7%	28.6%	12.9%	17.6%	17.3%	
MID ROAD	43.0%	53.1%	30.7%	38.8%	48.1%	39.4%	34.8%	48.1%	28.6%	35.5%	42.5%	39.1%	
LIBERAL	22.1%	32.8%	58.0%	45.6%	27.2%	46.6%	34.8%	27.2%	42.9%	51.6%	39.9%	43.7%	
Q45.RELIGIOUS FAITH													
PROTESTANT	18.7%	23.3%	21.3%	26.0%	3.6%	28.1%	41.7%	3.6%	28.6%	9.4%	19.9%	22.7%	
CATHOLIC	51.6%	23.3%	20.7%	17.4%	71.1%	15.3%	4.2%	71.1%	42.9%	34.4%	26.5%	30.8%	
JEWISH	.0%	1.6%	3.4%	2.6%	.0%	3.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	1.5%	2.5%	
MUSLIM	.0%	.8%	.6%	.6%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.5%	
BUDDHIST	.0%	2.3%	4.6%	3.5%	.0%	2.6%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	6.3%	2.6%	3.0%	
OTHER	17.6%	22.5%	19.0%	20.3%	18.1%	18.3%	25.0%	18.1%	.0%	31.3%	20.4%	19.2%	
NONE	12.1%	26.4%	30.5%	29.6%	7.2%	32.8%	20.8%	7.2%	.0%	15.6%	28.6%	21.2%	
Q46.FREQUENCY ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES													
ONCE A WEEK	32.2%	25.2%	17.6%	20.7%	33.3%	16.2%	41.7%	33.3%	33.3%	31.3%	21.4%	25.4%	
ONCE A MONTH	14.4%	11.8%	5.7%	7.8%	16.7%	8.1%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	.0%	12.2%	7.1%	
SEVERAL TIMES/YR	22.2%	21.3%	25.0%	23.0%	23.8%	22.2%	29.2%	23.8%	16.7%	31.3%	20.4%	25.9%	
ONCE A YEAR/LESS	10.0%	5.5%	12.5%	10.4%	7.1%	10.7%	.0%	7.1%	.0%	15.6%	10.2%	9.1%	
NOT AT ALL	21.1%	36.2%	39.2%	38.2%	19.0%	42.7%	20.8%	19.0%	33.3%	21.9%	35.7%	32.5%	
Q49.EVER USED SYRINGES OR IV NEEDLES													
YES	14.3%	13.2%	18.5%	15.2%	18.1%	16.0%	12.5%	18.1%	28.6%	12.5%	14.6%	17.0%	
NO	85.7%	86.8%	81.5%	84.8%	81.9%	84.0%	87.5%	81.9%	71.4%	87.5%	85.4%	83.0%	

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q3_1.LEARN COMMUNITY EVENTS: COMMUNITY MEETINGS												
NOT AT ALL	62.6%	62.8%	59.8%	63.0%	54.8%	65.0%	58.3%	54.8%	57.1%	71.9%	59.5%	63.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.6%	25.6%	26.3%	26.3%	28.6%	25.3%	41.7%	28.6%	28.6%	12.5%	28.0%	25.5%
DK	.0%	.0%	.6%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%
OFTEN	6.6%	7.0%	10.1%	7.0%	13.1%	5.5%	.0%	13.1%	14.3%	12.5%	9.0%	7.5%
VERY OFTEN	2.2%	4.7%	3.4%	3.5%	3.6%	4.2%	.0%	3.6%	.0%	3.1%	3.0%	4.0%
Q3_2.NEWSPAPERS												
NOT AT ALL	29.7%	13.2%	7.8%	13.3%	19.0%	13.9%	8.3%	19.0%	14.3%	12.5%	13.5%	15.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	16.5%	29.5%	22.9%	24.4%	20.2%	26.2%	12.5%	20.2%	28.6%	25.0%	24.0%	23.0%
DK	.0%	.0%	.6%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%
OFTEN	34.1%	40.3%	44.1%	41.1%	39.3%	38.8%	50.0%	39.3%	42.9%	43.8%	44.5%	37.0%
VERY OFTEN	19.8%	17.1%	24.6%	20.9%	21.4%	21.1%	29.2%	21.4%	14.3%	18.8%	17.5%	24.5%
Q3_3.COMMUNITY NEWSLE												
NOT AT ALL	18.7%	27.9%	15.1%	20.9%	16.7%	21.9%	29.2%	16.7%	28.6%	15.6%	21.5%	18.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.6%	36.4%	22.3%	28.8%	27.4%	27.0%	29.2%	27.4%	28.6%	37.5%	33.0%	24.0%
OFTEN	39.6%	26.4%	41.3%	35.4%	38.1%	35.0%	25.0%	38.1%	42.9%	40.6%	34.0%	38.0%
VERY OFTEN	13.2%	9.3%	21.2%	14.9%	17.9%	16.0%	16.7%	17.9%	.0%	6.3%	11.5%	19.5%
Q3_4.POSTERS												
NOT AT ALL	26.4%	21.7%	24.6%	25.3%	20.2%	26.6%	16.7%	20.2%	14.3%	25.0%	26.5%	22.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.5%	38.0%	36.3%	38.0%	22.6%	37.6%	29.2%	22.6%	57.1%	43.8%	38.5%	31.0%
DK	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.3%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.5%
OFTEN	31.9%	34.1%	32.4%	29.4%	45.2%	28.7%	33.3%	45.2%	28.6%	31.3%	28.5%	37.0%
VERY OFTEN	14.3%	6.2%	5.6%	7.0%	10.7%	7.2%	20.8%	10.7%	.0%	.0%	6.0%	9.5%
Q3_4.POSTERS												
NOT AT ALL	26.4%	21.7%	24.6%	25.3%	20.2%	26.6%	16.7%	20.2%	14.3%	25.0%	26.5%	22.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.5%	38.0%	36.3%	38.0%	22.6%	37.6%	29.2%	22.6%	57.1%	43.8%	38.5%	31.0%
DK	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.3%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.5%
OFTEN	31.9%	34.1%	32.4%	29.4%	45.2%	28.7%	33.3%	45.2%	28.6%	31.3%	28.5%	37.0%
VERY OFTEN	14.3%	6.2%	5.6%	7.0%	10.7%	7.2%	20.8%	10.7%	.0%	.0%	6.0%	9.5%
Q3_5.RADIO												
NOT AT ALL	35.2%	29.5%	34.6%	35.4%	25.0%	36.7%	25.0%	25.0%	28.6%	28.1%	33.0%	33.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	25.3%	42.6%	38.5%	35.8%	40.5%	35.4%	33.3%	40.5%	42.9%	40.6%	40.5%	33.0%
DK	.0%	.0%	.6%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%
OFTEN	27.5%	20.9%	21.2%	22.8%	21.4%	22.8%	25.0%	21.4%	28.6%	28.1%	20.0%	25.0%
VERY OFTEN	12.1%	7.0%	5.0%	5.7%	13.1%	5.1%	16.7%	13.1%	.0%	3.1%	6.0%	8.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q3 6.TV												
NOT AT ALL	23.1%	27.9%	31.8%	30.4%	21.4%	29.1%	33.3%	21.4%	.0%	43.8%	28.5%	28.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	29.7%	36.4%	42.5%	38.9%	33.3%	39.7%	16.7%	33.3%	71.4%	34.4%	40.5%	35.0%
OFTEN	27.5%	26.4%	18.4%	22.8%	23.8%	22.8%	33.3%	23.8%	14.3%	21.9%	23.0%	23.0%
VERY OFTEN	19.8%	9.3%	7.3%	7.9%	21.4%	8.4%	16.7%	21.4%	14.3%	.0%	8.0%	13.5%
Q3 7.FAMILY MEMBERS												
NOT AT ALL	46.2%	55.8%	58.1%	59.5%	36.9%	62.0%	33.3%	36.9%	28.6%	56.3%	60.5%	49.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	20.9%	21.7%	19.0%	19.3%	23.8%	18.6%	29.2%	23.8%	57.1%	15.6%	21.5%	19.0%
DK	1.1%	.0%	.6%	.3%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	3.1%	.0%	1.0%
OFTEN	25.3%	17.8%	19.0%	17.4%	29.8%	16.0%	29.2%	29.8%	.0%	25.0%	14.0%	26.0%
VERY OFTEN	6.6%	4.7%	3.4%	3.5%	8.3%	3.4%	8.3%	8.3%	14.3%	.0%	4.0%	5.0%
Q3 8.FRIENDS/NEIGHBOR												
NOT AT ALL	20.9%	20.9%	16.8%	18.4%	21.4%	18.1%	29.2%	21.4%	14.3%	18.8%	20.0%	18.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.6%	33.3%	30.2%	32.3%	25.0%	34.6%	16.7%	25.0%	57.1%	28.1%	30.5%	31.0%
DK	.0%	.8%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%
OFTEN	36.3%	32.6%	38.5%	35.8%	38.1%	34.2%	37.5%	38.1%	14.3%	37.5%	34.5%	38.0%
VERY OFTEN	14.3%	12.4%	14.5%	13.3%	15.5%	12.7%	16.7%	15.5%	14.3%	15.6%	14.5%	13.0%
Q3 9.PEOPLE AT WORK/S												
NOT AT ALL	44.0%	41.9%	49.7%	50.0%	29.8%	51.1%	45.8%	29.8%	57.1%	40.6%	43.0%	48.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	24.2%	27.9%	29.1%	27.5%	27.4%	28.7%	12.5%	27.4%	14.3%	34.4%	30.0%	25.0%
DK	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	4.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
OFTEN	22.0%	24.8%	16.2%	17.1%	33.3%	16.0%	25.0%	33.3%	14.3%	18.8%	21.5%	19.5%
VERY OFTEN	8.8%	5.4%	5.0%	5.1%	9.5%	4.2%	12.5%	9.5%	14.3%	6.3%	5.5%	6.5%
Q3 10.POLITICIANS/PUBL												
NOT AT ALL	49.5%	39.5%	39.1%	40.2%	46.4%	38.0%	41.7%	46.4%	28.6%	56.3%	40.5%	42.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	31.9%	44.2%	38.0%	40.2%	33.3%	42.6%	45.8%	33.3%	57.1%	15.6%	42.5%	35.0%
DK	1.1%	.8%	.6%	.9%	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	1.0%	.5%
OFTEN	12.1%	10.1%	18.4%	14.6%	13.1%	15.6%	8.3%	13.1%	14.3%	15.6%	11.0%	17.5%
VERY OFTEN	5.5%	5.4%	3.9%	4.1%	7.1%	3.4%	4.2%	7.1%	.0%	9.4%	5.0%	4.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %

Q14 1.PROGRAMS: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE												
DISAGREE STR	13.2%	10.9%	10.1%	10.8%	11.9%	10.5%	20.8%	11.9%	28.6%	6.3%	11.5%	10.5%
DISAGREE	30.8%	41.1%	41.9%	40.2%	34.5%	42.2%	29.2%	34.5%	14.3%	43.8%	37.5%	40.5%
NEUTRAL	4.4%	9.3%	12.8%	11.4%	3.6%	11.4%	8.3%	3.6%	28.6%	3.1%	8.5%	11.0%
AGREE	29.7%	26.4%	26.3%	26.3%	31.0%	24.1%	29.2%	31.0%	28.6%	40.6%	26.5%	28.0%
AGREE STR	22.0%	12.4%	8.9%	11.4%	19.0%	11.8%	12.5%	19.0%	.0%	6.3%	16.0%	10.0%

Q14 2.ATTRACT DRUG DEALERS												
DISAGREE STR	12.1%	7.8%	12.8%	11.7%	8.3%	10.5%	25.0%	8.3%	.0%	9.4%	11.5%	10.5%
DISAGREE	16.5%	38.8%	43.0%	39.2%	21.4%	42.6%	29.2%	21.4%	42.9%	34.4%	33.5%	37.5%
NEUTRAL	4.4%	10.1%	14.5%	12.7%	3.6%	11.4%	8.3%	3.6%	14.3%	15.6%	11.5%	10.0%
AGREE	40.7%	28.7%	21.2%	25.0%	40.5%	25.3%	12.5%	40.5%	42.9%	28.1%	27.5%	29.0%
AGREE STR	26.4%	14.7%	8.4%	11.4%	26.2%	10.1%	25.0%	26.2%	.0%	12.5%	16.0%	13.0%

Q14 3.LOWER PROPERTY VALUES												
DISAGREE STR	11.0%	13.2%	9.5%	12.0%	7.1%	11.4%	16.7%	7.1%	.0%	15.6%	12.5%	9.5%
DISAGREE	24.2%	27.9%	42.5%	36.1%	23.8%	38.0%	37.5%	37.5%	28.6%	31.3%	34.0%	33.0%
NEUTRAL	12.1%	13.2%	10.6%	11.4%	14.3%	10.5%	8.3%	14.3%	28.6%	12.5%	9.0%	15.0%
AGREE	35.2%	31.0%	29.1%	29.1%	38.1%	29.1%	12.5%	38.1%	42.9%	34.4%	31.5%	30.5%
AGREE STR	17.6%	14.7%	8.4%	11.4%	16.7%	11.0%	25.0%	16.7%	.0%	6.3%	13.0%	12.0%

Q14 4.REDUCE PUBLIC COSTS OF HIV/AIDS												
DISAGREE STR	29.7%	24.0%	30.7%	30.4%	20.2%	30.8%	37.5%	20.2%	71.4%	25.0%	27.5%	29.0%
DISAGREE	34.1%	45.0%	45.3%	43.0%	41.7%	44.3%	33.3%	41.7%	14.3%	43.8%	44.0%	41.5%
NEUTRAL	6.6%	7.0%	9.5%	7.9%	8.3%	7.2%	4.2%	8.3%	.0%	9.4%	7.0%	9.0%
AGREE	22.0%	14.7%	11.2%	13.0%	21.4%	12.2%	12.5%	21.4%	14.3%	15.6%	14.0%	15.5%
AGREE STR	7.7%	9.3%	3.4%	5.7%	8.3%	5.5%	12.5%	8.3%	.0%	6.3%	7.5%	5.0%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %

Q14 5.REDUCE COMMUNICABLE DISEASE												
DISAGREE STR	26.4%	31.8%	35.8%	34.8%	22.6%	35.4%	37.5%	22.6%	57.1%	31.3%	32.5%	32.0%
DISAGREE	45.1%	42.6%	47.5%	44.6%	47.6%	43.0%	45.8%	47.6%	14.3%	59.4%	45.5%	45.0%
NEUTRAL	1.1%	6.2%	3.9%	5.1%	1.2%	5.5%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	6.3%	4.5%	4.0%
AGREE	19.8%	11.6%	8.9%	10.4%	19.0%	11.0%	8.3%	19.0%	28.6%	.0%	11.5%	13.0%
AGREE STR	7.7%	7.8%	3.9%	5.1%	9.5%	5.1%	8.3%	9.5%	.0%	3.1%	6.0%	6.0%

Q14 6.DECREASE CRIME												
DISAGREE STR	11.0%	3.9%	6.7%	6.3%	9.5%	5.9%	.0%	9.5%	14.3%	12.5%	7.5%	6.5%
DISAGREE	20.9%	23.3%	25.7%	23.7%	23.8%	25.3%	33.3%	23.8%	.0%	15.6%	23.0%	24.5%
NEUTRAL	7.7%	15.5%	17.3%	15.8%	9.5%	16.0%	12.5%	9.5%	28.6%	12.5%	16.0%	13.0%
AGREE	44.0%	41.1%	40.2%	42.1%	38.1%	40.5%	37.5%	38.1%	57.1%	53.1%	40.0%	42.5%
AGREE STR	16.5%	16.3%	10.1%	12.0%	19.0%	12.2%	16.7%	19.0%	.0%	6.3%	13.5%	13.5%

Q14 7.INCREASE COMMUNITY CONFLICT												
DISAGREE STR	8.8%	2.3%	7.8%	5.1%	10.7%	4.6%	8.3%	10.7%	.0%	3.1%	6.0%	6.5%
DISAGREE	22.0%	29.5%	31.3%	30.7%	20.2%	30.8%	33.3%	20.2%	42.9%	25.0%	30.5%	26.5%
NEUTRAL	2.2%	7.0%	9.5%	8.2%	2.4%	9.3%	4.2%	2.4%	14.3%	6.3%	6.0%	8.0%
AGREE	41.8%	43.4%	37.4%	39.9%	42.9%	37.6%	37.5%	42.9%	42.9%	56.3%	41.0%	40.0%
AGREE STR	25.3%	17.8%	14.0%	16.1%	23.8%	17.7%	16.7%	23.8%	.0%	9.4%	16.5%	19.0%

Q14 8.ATTRACT HOMELESS												
DISAGREE STR	8.8%	4.7%	10.1%	8.9%	6.0%	8.4%	12.5%	6.0%	.0%	9.4%	7.0%	9.5%
DISAGREE	20.9%	38.8%	40.2%	37.7%	26.2%	38.8%	20.8%	26.2%	28.6%	43.8%	39.5%	31.0%
NEUTRAL	6.6%	5.4%	9.5%	8.5%	3.6%	8.9%	8.3%	3.6%	14.3%	3.1%	6.5%	8.5%
AGREE	46.2%	34.1%	27.9%	31.6%	42.9%	32.5%	33.3%	42.9%	42.9%	25.0%	31.0%	37.0%
AGREE STR	17.6%	17.1%	12.3%	13.3%	21.4%	11.4%	25.0%	21.4%	14.3%	18.8%	16.0%	14.0%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A 1. HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM: COMMUNITY MEETINGS												
NOT AT ALL	61.1%	69.5%	64.8%	67.5%	56.3%	73.8%	33.3%	56.3%	66.7%	41.7%	66.3%	64.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	33.3%	18.6%	18.7%	20.1%	28.1%	13.1%	66.7%	28.1%	33.3%	41.7%	21.7%	21.3%
OFTEN	5.6%	6.8%	13.2%	10.4%	6.3%	10.7%	.0%	6.3%	.0%	16.7%	8.7%	10.6%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	5.1%	3.3%	1.9%	9.4%	2.5%	.0%	9.4%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	3.2%
Q15A 2. NEWSPAPERS												
NOT AT ALL	44.4%	35.6%	20.9%	28.6%	37.5%	26.2%	22.2%	37.5%	33.3%	41.7%	28.6%	31.6%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.8%	37.3%	37.4%	34.4%	40.6%	34.4%	22.2%	40.6%	66.7%	33.3%	36.3%	34.7%
OFTEN	16.7%	22.0%	25.3%	24.7%	12.5%	26.2%	44.4%	12.5%	.0%	8.3%	19.8%	25.3%
VERY OFTEN	11.1%	5.1%	16.5%	12.3%	9.4%	13.1%	11.1%	9.4%	.0%	16.7%	15.4%	8.4%
Q15A 3. COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER												
NOT AT ALL	38.9%	44.8%	28.3%	36.4%	31.3%	39.3%	22.2%	31.3%	.0%	16.7%	37.4%	33.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.8%	24.1%	33.7%	29.2%	31.3%	26.2%	55.6%	31.3%	66.7%	33.3%	33.0%	26.3%
OFTEN	25.0%	24.1%	28.3%	27.3%	21.9%	26.2%	11.1%	21.9%	33.3%	50.0%	20.9%	31.6%
VERY OFTEN	8.3%	6.9%	9.8%	7.1%	15.6%	8.2%	11.1%	15.6%	.0%	.0%	8.8%	8.4%
Q15A 4. POSTERS												
NOT AT ALL	63.9%	76.3%	71.4%	76.0%	50.0%	78.7%	66.7%	50.0%	33.3%	66.7%	72.5%	70.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.8%	16.9%	20.9%	18.8%	31.3%	16.4%	33.3%	31.3%	66.7%	25.0%	20.9%	21.1%
OFTEN	5.6%	6.8%	7.7%	5.2%	15.6%	4.9%	.0%	15.6%	.0%	8.3%	5.5%	8.4%
VERY OFTEN	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.0%
Q15A 5. RADIO												
NOT AT ALL	66.7%	62.1%	65.2%	64.9%	62.5%	65.0%	55.6%	62.5%	66.7%	54.5%	62.6%	66.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	22.2%	25.9%	23.9%	25.3%	18.8%	26.8%	22.2%	18.8%	33.3%	27.3%	30.8%	17.9%
OFTEN	8.3%	10.3%	10.9%	9.1%	15.6%	7.3%	22.2%	15.6%	.0%	18.2%	5.5%	14.7%
VERY OFTEN	2.8%	1.7%	.0%	.6%	3.1%	.8%	.0%	3.1%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	1.1%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A 6. TV												
NOT AT ALL	44.4%	44.8%	47.3%	46.4%	43.8%	43.4%	44.4%	43.8%	33.3%	72.7%	44.4%	47.4%
NOT VERY OFTEN	33.3%	41.4%	38.5%	37.3%	43.8%	39.3%	33.3%	43.8%	.0%	27.3%	43.3%	33.7%
OFTEN	16.7%	13.8%	9.9%	13.7%	6.3%	14.8%	22.2%	6.3%	33.3%	.0%	8.9%	15.8%
VERY OFTEN	5.6%	.0%	4.4%	2.6%	6.3%	2.5%	.0%	6.3%	33.3%	.0%	3.3%	3.2%
Q15A 7. FAMILY MEMBERS												
NOT AT ALL	70.6%	71.2%	76.9%	78.6%	50.0%	77.9%	66.7%	50.0%	100.0%	83.3%	80.2%	67.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	20.6%	16.9%	13.2%	13.6%	26.7%	13.1%	33.3%	26.7%	.0%	8.3%	11.0%	20.4%
OFTEN	2.9%	6.8%	4.4%	4.5%	6.7%	4.9%	.0%	6.7%	.0%	8.3%	3.3%	6.5%
VERY OFTEN	5.9%	5.1%	5.5%	3.2%	16.7%	4.1%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	5.5%	5.4%
Q15A 8. FRIENDS/NEIGHBORS												
NOT AT ALL	47.2%	49.2%	35.9%	45.8%	25.0%	48.8%	22.2%	25.0%	33.3%	41.7%	43.5%	41.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	19.4%	23.7%	28.3%	24.5%	28.1%	21.1%	55.6%	28.1%	33.3%	16.7%	28.3%	22.1%
OFTEN	25.0%	15.3%	25.0%	19.4%	34.4%	18.7%	11.1%	34.4%	33.3%	33.3%	19.6%	24.2%
VERY OFTEN	8.3%	11.9%	10.9%	10.3%	12.5%	11.4%	11.1%	12.5%	.0%	8.3%	8.7%	12.6%
Q15A 9. PEOPLE AT WORK/SCHOOL												
NOT AT ALL	66.7%	64.4%	69.2%	69.5%	56.3%	72.1%	44.4%	56.3%	33.3%	66.7%	65.2%	69.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	13.9%	13.6%	17.6%	16.2%	12.5%	13.1%	33.3%	12.5%	66.7%	16.7%	16.3%	14.9%
OFTEN	13.9%	15.3%	8.8%	9.7%	21.9%	9.8%	22.2%	21.9%	.0%	8.3%	14.1%	9.6%
VERY OFTEN	5.6%	6.8%	4.4%	4.5%	9.4%	4.9%	.0%	9.4%	.0%	8.3%	4.3%	6.4%
Q15A 10. POLITICIANS/PUBLIC												
NOT AT ALL	63.9%	44.1%	31.9%	37.0%	65.6%	37.4%	44.4%	65.6%	33.3%	25.0%	33.0%	50.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	25.0%	44.1%	37.4%	40.9%	18.8%	41.5%	44.4%	18.8%	33.3%	33.3%	45.1%	29.5%
OFTEN	5.6%	8.5%	20.9%	14.9%	9.4%	13.8%	.0%	9.4%	33.3%	33.3%	12.1%	15.8%
VERY OFTEN	5.6%	3.4%	9.9%	7.1%	6.3%	7.3%	11.1%	6.3%	.0%	8.3%	9.9%	4.2%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27_1.CONSEQUENCES: INCREASE NUMBER NEEDLES												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	14.3%	17.1%	20.7%	20.3%	9.5%	22.4%	29.2%	9.5%	.0%	9.4%	19.0%	17.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	37.4%	36.4%	45.3%	44.3%	26.2%	45.6%	33.3%	26.2%	71.4%	43.8%	38.5%	42.5%
DK	4.4%	3.9%	8.9%	7.3%	2.4%	6.8%	4.2%	2.4%	.0%	12.5%	6.0%	6.5%
LIKELY	19.8%	15.5%	14.5%	13.9%	25.0%	12.2%	8.3%	25.0%	28.6%	18.8%	18.5%	14.0%
VERY LIKELY	24.2%	27.1%	10.6%	14.2%	36.9%	13.1%	25.0%	36.9%	.0%	15.6%	18.0%	20.0%
Q27_2.DECREASE INJECTION DRUG USE												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	16.5%	18.6%	19.0%	18.7%	16.7%	17.7%	25.0%	16.7%	14.3%	18.8%	17.0%	19.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	33.0%	41.1%	39.1%	39.9%	33.3%	41.8%	25.0%	33.3%	42.9%	34.4%	38.5%	38.5%
DK	4.4%	3.9%	8.4%	7.3%	1.2%	7.6%	8.3%	1.2%	.0%	6.3%	5.0%	7.0%
LIKELY	25.3%	27.1%	24.6%	25.6%	25.0%	25.3%	20.8%	25.0%	28.6%	31.3%	26.0%	25.0%
VERY LIKELY	20.9%	9.3%	8.9%	8.5%	23.8%	7.6%	20.8%	23.8%	14.3%	9.4%	13.5%	10.0%
Q27_3.THREATEN SAFETY OF CHILDREN												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	13.2%	17.8%	20.1%	19.6%	10.7%	19.4%	25.0%	10.7%	.0%	18.8%	20.0%	15.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	20.9%	36.4%	45.8%	40.8%	23.8%	45.1%	25.0%	23.8%	28.6%	31.3%	39.5%	35.0%
DK	8.8%	8.5%	7.3%	9.2%	3.6%	8.4%	4.2%	3.6%	42.9%	9.4%	5.5%	10.5%
LIKELY	26.4%	16.3%	20.1%	18.7%	26.2%	15.6%	20.8%	26.2%	28.6%	31.3%	22.5%	18.0%
VERY LIKELY	30.8%	20.9%	6.7%	11.7%	35.7%	11.4%	25.0%	35.7%	.0%	9.4%	12.5%	21.0%
Q27_4.ATTRACT CRIME												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	11.0%	7.8%	12.3%	11.4%	8.3%	10.1%	20.8%	8.3%	.0%	6.3%	12.0%	9.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	30.8%	42.6%	46.9%	45.3%	28.6%	48.5%	37.5%	28.6%	71.4%	37.5%	40.5%	43.0%
DK	5.5%	12.4%	7.8%	9.5%	6.0%	9.3%	4.2%	6.0%	14.3%	12.5%	7.5%	10.0%
LIKELY	31.9%	18.6%	24.6%	21.2%	35.7%	20.7%	8.3%	35.7%	14.3%	31.3%	27.5%	21.0%
VERY LIKELY	20.9%	18.6%	8.4%	12.7%	21.4%	11.4%	29.2%	21.4%	.0%	12.5%	12.5%	16.5%
Q27_5.BRING COMMUNITY TOGETHER												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	8.8%	9.3%	6.7%	8.9%	4.8%	6.8%	29.2%	4.8%	.0%	9.4%	8.5%	7.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	20.9%	27.9%	34.6%	33.5%	14.3%	35.4%	8.3%	14.3%	42.9%	28.1%	32.5%	26.5%
DK	5.5%	6.2%	6.7%	6.3%	6.0%	7.2%	.0%	6.0%	14.3%	6.3%	6.5%	6.0%
LIKELY	36.3%	38.0%	39.1%	35.1%	48.8%	35.4%	29.2%	48.8%	14.3%	43.8%	33.5%	42.5%
VERY LIKELY	28.6%	18.6%	12.8%	16.1%	26.2%	15.2%	33.3%	26.2%	28.6%	12.5%	19.0%	17.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27 6.LEAD USERS TO SEEK ADDICTION HELP												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	12.1%	10.1%	4.5%	7.9%	8.3%	4.6%	41.7%	8.3%	14.3%	3.1%	7.5%	8.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	22.0%	20.9%	22.3%	23.4%	16.7%	23.6%	12.5%	16.7%	14.3%	21.9%	23.0%	21.0%
DK	6.6%	7.0%	14.0%	10.8%	7.1%	11.4%	4.2%	7.1%	14.3%	9.4%	9.5%	10.5%
LIKELY	24.2%	39.5%	41.3%	38.6%	29.8%	42.6%	4.2%	29.8%	28.6%	43.8%	36.5%	37.0%
VERY LIKELY	35.2%	22.5%	17.9%	19.3%	38.1%	17.7%	37.5%	38.1%	28.6%	21.9%	23.5%	23.0%
Q27 7.LEAD USERS TO SEEK HIV/AIDS HELP												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	3.3%	10.9%	4.5%	6.3%	6.0%	5.9%	20.8%	6.0%	.0%	.0%	6.5%	6.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	20.9%	14.7%	17.3%	17.4%	16.7%	18.1%	8.3%	16.7%	28.6%	15.6%	14.0%	20.5%
DK	9.9%	7.0%	11.2%	9.8%	9.5%	9.3%	4.2%	9.5%	14.3%	12.5%	9.0%	10.5%
LIKELY	36.3%	36.4%	45.8%	42.4%	33.3%	45.6%	29.2%	33.3%	28.6%	31.3%	47.0%	34.0%
VERY LIKELY	29.7%	31.0%	21.2%	24.1%	34.5%	21.1%	37.5%	34.5%	28.6%	40.6%	23.5%	29.0%
Q27 8.INCREASE ADDICTION IN AREA												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	13.2%	21.7%	22.9%	24.1%	7.1%	24.5%	41.7%	7.1%	.0%	12.5%	20.5%	20.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	25.3%	38.0%	50.3%	42.1%	34.5%	46.0%	12.5%	34.5%	57.1%	37.5%	43.0%	38.0%
DK	11.0%	9.3%	7.3%	9.2%	7.1%	8.9%	12.5%	7.1%	.0%	9.4%	7.0%	10.5%
LIKELY	26.4%	14.0%	12.8%	14.9%	21.4%	12.7%	12.5%	21.4%	42.9%	25.0%	18.0%	14.5%
VERY LIKELY	24.2%	17.1%	6.7%	9.8%	29.8%	8.0%	20.8%	29.8%	.0%	15.6%	11.5%	16.5%
Q27 9.REDUCE SPREAD HIV/AIDS IN AREA												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	2.2%	6.2%	5.0%	5.1%	3.6%	4.2%	8.3%	3.6%	.0%	6.3%	3.5%	6.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	20.9%	14.0%	9.5%	12.3%	17.9%	13.1%	8.3%	17.9%	.0%	12.5%	16.0%	11.0%
DK	3.3%	3.9%	6.7%	6.0%	1.2%	5.1%	12.5%	1.2%	.0%	9.4%	3.0%	7.0%
LIKELY	33.0%	34.9%	36.9%	35.1%	36.9%	36.3%	29.2%	36.9%	28.6%	28.1%	35.0%	36.0%
VERY LIKELY	40.7%	41.1%	41.9%	41.5%	40.5%	41.4%	41.7%	40.5%	71.4%	43.8%	42.5%	40.0%
Q27 10.REDUCE SPREAD HEP C IN AREA												
NOT AT ALL LKLY	6.6%	5.4%	2.2%	3.5%	7.1%	3.0%	12.5%	7.1%	.0%	3.1%	5.5%	3.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	13.2%	13.2%	14.0%	13.0%	15.5%	13.5%	4.2%	15.5%	14.3%	15.6%	14.0%	13.0%
DK	3.3%	6.2%	5.6%	6.6%	.0%	5.9%	4.2%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	4.0%	6.5%
LIKELY	25.3%	31.8%	35.8%	34.2%	25.0%	35.9%	20.8%	25.0%	14.3%	28.1%	36.0%	28.5%
VERY LIKELY	51.6%	43.4%	42.5%	42.7%	52.4%	41.8%	58.3%	52.4%	71.4%	40.6%	40.5%	49.0%
Q28 1.PROGRAM: IN NORTH PARK BECAUSE USERS ARE THERE												
NO	60.4%	71.3%	65.4%	68.4%	58.3%	66.2%	75.0%	58.3%	85.7%	75.0%	67.0%	65.5%
TRUE	39.6%	28.7%	34.6%	31.6%	41.7%	33.8%	25.0%	41.7%	14.3%	25.0%	33.0%	34.5%
Q28 2.PARENTS AFRAID LET KIDS PLAY OUTSIDE												
NO	49.5%	74.4%	87.7%	82.0%	47.6%	82.3%	70.8%	47.6%	57.1%	87.5%	78.5%	71.0%
TRUE	50.5%	25.6%	12.3%	18.0%	52.4%	17.7%	29.2%	52.4%	42.9%	12.5%	21.5%	29.0%
Q28 3.OFFICIALS DON T LISTEN TO CITIZENS												
NO	78.0%	80.6%	79.9%	79.4%	81.0%	81.4%	70.8%	81.0%	85.7%	78.1%	78.5%	81.0%
TRUE	22.0%	19.4%	20.1%	20.6%	19.0%	18.6%	29.2%	19.0%	14.3%	21.9%	21.5%	19.0%
Q28 4.CITIZENS NOT INTERESTED PROVIDING INPUT												
NO	75.8%	69.0%	62.6%	64.9%	77.4%	63.3%	66.7%	77.4%	57.1%	78.1%	64.5%	70.5%
TRUE	24.2%	31.0%	37.4%	35.1%	22.6%	36.7%	33.3%	22.6%	42.9%	21.9%	35.5%	29.5%
Q28 5.REASON PEOPLE WON T LIVE IN NORTH PARK												
NO	86.8%	87.6%	93.9%	91.5%	85.7%	92.4%	87.5%	85.7%	71.4%	90.6%	89.5%	91.0%
TRUE	13.2%	12.4%	6.1%	8.5%	14.3%	7.6%	12.5%	14.3%	28.6%	9.4%	10.5%	9.0%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_6.DISTRIBUTED NEEDLES ARE MONITORED												
NO	59.3%	49.6%	63.1%	57.3%	59.5%	54.9%	66.7%	59.5%	71.4%	62.5%	54.0%	61.5%
TRUE	40.7%	50.4%	36.9%	42.7%	40.5%	45.1%	33.3%	40.5%	28.6%	37.5%	46.0%	38.5%
Q28_7.PROVIDED IMMEDIATE REFERRALS												
NO	73.6%	73.6%	72.1%	73.7%	70.2%	73.8%	75.0%	70.2%	57.1%	71.9%	71.0%	75.0%
TRUE	26.4%	26.4%	27.9%	26.3%	29.8%	26.2%	25.0%	29.8%	42.9%	28.1%	29.0%	25.0%
Q28_8.CITY NOTIFIED CITIZENS DURING PLANNING												
NO	83.5%	82.2%	87.2%	84.5%	85.7%	82.7%	91.7%	85.7%	85.7%	87.5%	86.5%	83.0%
TRUE	16.5%	17.8%	12.8%	15.5%	14.3%	17.3%	8.3%	14.3%	14.3%	12.5%	13.5%	17.0%
Q28_9.CITIZENS HAVE INFLUENCE OVER OPERATION												
NO	52.7%	45.7%	40.2%	42.4%	53.6%	41.4%	58.3%	53.6%	14.3%	46.9%	41.5%	48.0%
TRUE	47.3%	54.3%	59.8%	57.6%	46.4%	58.6%	41.7%	46.4%	85.7%	53.1%	58.5%	52.0%
Q28_10.RESIDENTS COULD PARTICIPATE IMPLEMENTATION												
NO	83.5%	70.5%	68.7%	69.6%	83.3%	68.4%	75.0%	83.3%	42.9%	71.9%	68.5%	76.5%
TRUE	16.5%	29.5%	31.3%	30.4%	16.7%	31.6%	25.0%	16.7%	57.1%	28.1%	31.5%	23.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_11.I HEARD ABOUT PUBLIC FORUM ON PROGRAM												
NO	86.8%	85.3%	82.1%	84.2%	84.5%	83.1%	75.0%	84.5%	100.0%	90.6%	81.5%	87.0%
TRUE	13.2%	14.7%	17.9%	15.8%	15.5%	16.9%	25.0%	15.5%	.0%	9.4%	18.5%	13.0%
Q28_12.MOST CITIZENS KNOW LITTLE ABOUT PROGRAM												
NO	19.8%	20.2%	19.0%	18.4%	23.8%	18.6%	20.8%	23.8%	28.6%	15.6%	19.5%	19.5%
TRUE	80.2%	79.8%	81.0%	81.6%	76.2%	81.4%	79.2%	76.2%	71.4%	84.4%	80.5%	80.5%
Q28_13.BUSINESSES PAID SO WON'T OPPOSE												
NO	94.5%	96.1%	91.6%	94.6%	90.5%	95.8%	91.7%	90.5%	71.4%	90.6%	91.5%	96.0%
TRUE	5.5%	3.9%	8.4%	5.4%	9.5%	4.2%	8.3%	9.5%	28.6%	9.4%	8.5%	4.0%
Q28_14.CITY COUNCIL SHOWN RESPECT FOR CITIZENS												
NO	65.9%	78.3%	73.7%	75.6%	65.5%	74.3%	87.5%	65.5%	42.9%	75.0%	73.5%	73.5%
TRUE	34.1%	21.7%	26.3%	24.4%	34.5%	25.7%	12.5%	34.5%	57.1%	25.0%	26.5%	26.5%
Q28_15.WEALTHIER NEIGHBORHOODS DID NOT WANT												
NO	70.3%	55.8%	59.2%	58.9%	67.9%	56.5%	66.7%	67.9%	71.4%	65.6%	60.5%	61.0%
TRUE	29.7%	44.2%	40.8%	41.1%	32.1%	43.5%	33.3%	32.1%	28.6%	34.4%	39.5%	39.0%
Q28_16.POLICE RESPONSE ADEQUATE TO NP												
NO	63.7%	72.9%	73.7%	75.6%	54.8%	74.7%	79.2%	54.8%	100.0%	71.9%	74.0%	68.5%
TRUE	36.3%	27.1%	26.3%	24.4%	45.2%	25.3%	20.8%	45.2%	.0%	28.1%	26.0%	31.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q33_1.SUPPORT LOCATION: MEDICAL BUILDING												
NO	26.4%	17.1%	14.0%	17.1%	21.4%	15.6%	8.3%	21.4%	28.6%	21.9%	20.0%	16.0%
YES	73.6%	82.9%	86.0%	82.9%	78.6%	84.4%	91.7%	78.6%	71.4%	78.1%	80.0%	84.0%
Q33_2.PERMANENT BUILDING												
NO	28.6%	19.4%	26.3%	25.6%	21.4%	24.9%	12.5%	21.4%	42.9%	28.1%	24.0%	25.5%
YES	71.4%	80.6%	73.7%	74.4%	78.6%	75.1%	87.5%	78.6%	57.1%	71.9%	76.0%	74.5%
Q33_3.AWAY FROM SCHOOLS												
NO	26.4%	19.4%	17.3%	20.3%	20.2%	20.7%	12.5%	20.2%	14.3%	21.9%	20.5%	20.0%
YES	73.6%	80.6%	82.7%	79.7%	79.8%	79.3%	87.5%	79.8%	85.7%	78.1%	79.5%	80.0%
Q33_4.AWAY FROM HOMES												
NO	31.9%	20.9%	19.0%	21.2%	28.6%	20.7%	25.0%	28.6%	14.3%	18.8%	23.5%	22.0%
YES	68.1%	79.1%	81.0%	78.8%	71.4%	79.3%	75.0%	71.4%	85.7%	81.3%	76.5%	78.0%
Q33_5.ON OWN BLOCK												
NO	65.9%	61.2%	60.3%	60.8%	66.7%	62.4%	62.5%	66.7%	42.9%	40.6%	57.0%	67.0%
YES	34.1%	38.8%	39.7%	39.2%	33.3%	37.6%	37.5%	33.3%	57.1%	59.4%	43.0%	33.0%
Q33_6.FAR FROM HOME												
NO	36.3%	27.9%	28.5%	30.1%	31.0%	29.1%	25.0%	31.0%	42.9%	28.1%	34.0%	26.5%
YES	63.7%	72.1%	71.5%	69.9%	69.0%	70.9%	75.0%	69.0%	57.1%	71.9%	66.0%	73.5%
Q33_7.NEXT DOOR/ACROSS STREET												
NO	73.6%	69.0%	74.9%	71.2%	78.6%	73.0%	70.8%	78.6%	85.7%	46.9%	66.5%	79.0%
YES	26.4%	31.0%	25.1%	28.8%	21.4%	27.0%	29.2%	21.4%	14.3%	53.1%	33.5%	21.0%
Q33_8.LOCATED OUTSIDE NORTH PARK												
NO	37.4%	33.3%	30.2%	33.2%	32.1%	31.6%	37.5%	32.1%	42.9%	34.4%	34.5%	31.5%
YES	62.6%	66.7%	69.8%	66.8%	67.9%	68.4%	62.5%	67.9%	57.1%	65.6%	65.5%	68.5%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q34 1.POL PARTICIPATION-VOTE FOR PRESIDENT												
NOT AT ALL	44.4%	15.5%	5.6%	13.1%	34.9%	10.2%	20.8%	34.9%	42.9%	25.8%	18.4%	17.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	3.3%	3.9%	1.1%	1.9%	4.8%	.8%	4.2%	4.8%	14.3%	3.2%	1.5%	3.5%
OFTEN	21.1%	18.6%	19.8%	20.8%	15.7%	22.0%	16.7%	15.7%	28.6%	16.1%	19.9%	19.5%
VERY OFTEN	31.1%	62.0%	73.4%	64.2%	44.6%	66.9%	58.3%	44.6%	14.3%	54.8%	60.2%	60.0%
Q34 2.VOTE FOR CITY COUNCIL												
NOT AT ALL	47.3%	19.4%	11.3%	16.0%	45.2%	13.1%	20.8%	45.2%	57.1%	25.8%	22.8%	21.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	13.2%	11.6%	6.2%	9.3%	10.7%	8.1%	25.0%	10.7%	14.3%	6.5%	8.1%	11.0%
OFTEN	16.5%	24.8%	28.2%	26.8%	15.5%	27.1%	20.8%	15.5%	14.3%	29.0%	25.4%	23.5%
VERY OFTEN	23.1%	44.2%	54.2%	47.9%	28.6%	51.7%	33.3%	28.6%	14.3%	38.7%	43.7%	44.0%
Q34 3.VOTE IN PRIMARIES												
NOT AT ALL	40.7%	15.5%	9.0%	13.4%	36.9%	11.0%	16.7%	36.9%	42.9%	25.8%	19.8%	17.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	8.8%	6.2%	2.8%	4.8%	7.1%	3.4%	12.5%	7.1%	28.6%	3.2%	4.6%	6.0%
OFTEN	23.1%	25.6%	20.3%	22.4%	23.8%	22.0%	33.3%	23.8%	14.3%	16.1%	22.8%	22.5%
VERY OFTEN	27.5%	52.7%	67.8%	59.4%	32.1%	63.6%	37.5%	32.1%	14.3%	54.8%	52.8%	54.5%
Q34 4.CONTACT COUNCILMEN												
NOT AT ALL	75.8%	57.4%	40.4%	52.2%	60.7%	48.5%	58.3%	60.7%	71.4%	74.2%	53.5%	54.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	12.1%	26.4%	36.5%	29.3%	21.4%	32.1%	25.0%	21.4%	14.3%	9.7%	27.3%	28.0%
OFTEN	8.8%	10.1%	16.9%	13.1%	11.9%	13.5%	12.5%	11.9%	14.3%	9.7%	13.6%	12.0%
VERY OFTEN	3.3%	6.2%	6.2%	5.4%	6.0%	5.9%	4.2%	6.0%	.0%	6.5%	5.6%	5.5%
Q34 5.ATTEND NEIGHBORHOOD MTGS												
NOT AT ALL	62.6%	53.5%	42.1%	48.7%	57.1%	48.5%	45.8%	57.1%	42.9%	61.3%	54.0%	47.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	26.4%	31.0%	34.8%	33.8%	23.8%	32.9%	41.7%	23.8%	57.1%	29.0%	32.3%	31.0%
OFTEN	8.8%	14.0%	18.5%	14.6%	15.5%	15.6%	8.3%	15.5%	.0%	6.5%	11.1%	18.5%
VERY OFTEN	2.2%	1.6%	4.5%	2.9%	3.6%	3.0%	4.2%	3.6%	.0%	3.2%	2.5%	3.5%
Q34 6.TALK OTHERS ABOUT ISSUES												
NOT AT ALL	47.3%	20.2%	13.5%	18.2%	42.9%	18.6%	16.7%	42.9%	28.6%	12.9%	23.2%	23.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	24.2%	29.5%	25.8%	26.8%	26.2%	26.6%	33.3%	26.2%	42.9%	25.8%	25.3%	28.0%
OFTEN	22.0%	31.8%	35.4%	33.8%	21.4%	33.8%	16.7%	21.4%	28.6%	51.6%	32.8%	29.5%
VERY OFTEN	6.6%	16.6%	25.3%	21.3%	9.5%	21.1%	33.3%	9.5%	.0%	9.7%	18.7%	19.0%

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q34 7.ROLE IN COUNCIL CAMPAIGN												
NOT AT ALL	81.3%	70.5%	60.7%	67.8%	71.4%	67.1%	75.0%	71.4%	57.1%	74.2%	67.7%	69.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	11.0%	22.5%	24.7%	21.7%	17.9%	22.8%	16.7%	17.9%	42.9%	9.7%	21.2%	20.5%
OFTEN	4.4%	2.3%	9.0%	6.4%	3.6%	5.5%	4.2%	3.6%	.0%	12.9%	7.1%	4.5%
VERY OFTEN	3.3%	4.7%	5.6%	4.1%	7.1%	4.6%	4.2%	7.1%	.0%	3.2%	4.0%	5.5%
Q34 8.GIVE MONEY COUNCIL CAMPAIGN												
NOT AT ALL	76.7%	76.0%	67.8%	74.8%	63.9%	74.2%	79.2%	63.9%	71.4%	74.2%	73.6%	71.4%
NOT VERY OFTEN	15.6%	19.4%	20.9%	17.3%	26.5%	16.9%	20.8%	26.5%	28.6%	19.4%	18.3%	20.1%
OFTEN	6.7%	4.7%	7.3%	5.8%	8.4%	6.4%	.0%	8.4%	.0%	3.2%	6.1%	6.5%
VERY OFTEN	1.1%	.0%	4.0%	2.2%	1.2%	2.5%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	3.2%	2.0%	2.0%
Q34 9.WRITE LETTER TO NEWSPAPER												
NOT AT ALL	78.0%	66.7%	50.6%	58.3%	76.2%	56.1%	58.3%	76.2%	100.0%	61.3%	55.6%	68.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	15.4%	24.8%	39.3%	32.8%	15.5%	36.3%	29.2%	15.5%	.0%	25.8%	35.4%	23.0%
OFTEN	6.6%	5.4%	7.3%	6.4%	7.1%	5.5%	4.2%	7.1%	.0%	12.9%	6.1%	7.0%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	3.1%	2.8%	2.5%	1.2%	2.1%	8.3%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	3.0%	1.5%
Q34 10.ATTEND COUNCIL MTGS												
NOT AT ALL	73.6%	67.4%	60.7%	65.3%	67.9%	65.0%	54.2%	67.9%	71.4%	71.0%	63.6%	68.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.6%	27.9%	32.0%	29.3%	20.2%	28.7%	37.5%	20.2%	28.6%	29.0%	32.3%	22.5%
OFTEN	5.5%	4.7%	5.6%	4.5%	8.3%	5.1%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	6.5%
VERY OFTEN	3.3%	.0%	1.7%	1.0%	3.6%	1.3%	.0%	3.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.0%
Q34 11.SIGN PETITION												
NOT AT ALL	44.0%	11.6%	10.7%	12.7%	40.5%	12.2%	12.5%	40.5%	28.6%	12.9%	18.7%	18.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	16.5%	27.9%	25.3%	24.2%	23.8%	26.2%	16.7%	23.8%	42.9%	9.7%	25.3%	23.0%
OFTEN	30.8%	32.6%	44.9%	40.8%	26.2%	41.4%	37.5%	26.2%	14.3%	45.2%	40.4%	35.0%
VERY OFTEN	8.8%	27.9%	19.1%	22.3%	9.5%	20.3%	33.3%	9.5%	14.3%	32.3%	15.7%	23.5%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q13.APPROVE NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS								
DISAPPR STR	8.1%	12.3%	16.8%	3.7%	14.3%	45.1%	.0%	.0%
DISAPPR	10.2%	16.9%	10.6%	13.9%	14.3%	54.9%	.0%	.0%
NEUTRAL	8.9%	5.8%	7.5%	8.6%	6.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%
APPROVE	33.1%	27.3%	31.1%	31.6%	28.6%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
APPROVE STR	39.8%	37.7%	34.2%	42.2%	36.7%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Q17.APPROVAL OF NORTH PARK PROGRAM								
DISAPPR STR	8.1%	9.7%	12.4%	6.4%	10.2%	31.9%	4.1%	.6%
DISAPPR	7.6%	11.7%	11.2%	7.0%	10.2%	27.5%	5.7%	1.9%
NEUTRAL	22.0%	26.0%	23.0%	23.5%	24.5%	33.0%	24.4%	9.7%
APPROVE	38.6%	34.4%	33.5%	42.2%	30.6%	7.7%	60.2%	38.1%
APPROVE STR	23.7%	18.2%	19.9%	20.9%	24.5%	.0%	5.7%	49.7%
Q16.EXTENT PILOT PROGRAM AFFECTS ME								
NOT AT ALL	61.1%	56.4%	60.8%	60.0%	55.3%	38.2%	65.3%	66.4%
NOT MUCH	15.8%	15.4%	12.7%	16.8%	17.0%	15.7%	17.4%	13.8%
SOME	15.8%	17.4%	15.2%	16.8%	21.3%	28.1%	11.6%	14.5%
A GREAT DEAL	7.3%	10.7%	11.4%	6.5%	6.4%	18.0%	5.8%	5.3%
Q24.PROGRAM EFFECT ON OWN LIFE								
VERY NEG	1.7%	6.5%	6.2%	1.6%	2.0%	12.1%	1.6%	.0%
SOMEWT NEG	6.4%	3.2%	5.0%	4.8%	10.2%	15.4%	3.3%	1.9%
NEUTRAL	80.1%	79.9%	79.5%	80.2%	79.6%	69.2%	85.4%	80.0%
SOMEWHT POS	10.2%	6.5%	6.2%	10.7%	8.2%	2.2%	7.3%	14.2%
VERY POS	1.7%	3.9%	3.1%	2.7%	.0%	1.1%	2.4%	3.9%
Q25.PROGRAM EFFECT ON COMMUNITY								
VERY NEG	3.8%	8.4%	8.7%	3.2%	6.1%	18.7%	2.4%	1.3%
SOMEWT NEG	11.0%	11.0%	13.7%	9.1%	12.2%	22.0%	9.8%	7.1%
NEUTRAL	48.3%	43.5%	46.0%	49.2%	40.8%	49.5%	50.4%	36.1%
SOMEWHT POS	28.8%	26.6%	23.0%	33.2%	22.4%	7.7%	32.5%	38.1%
VERY POS	8.1%	10.4%	8.7%	5.3%	18.4%	2.2%	4.9%	17.4%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q26.EFFECT OF PROGRAM ON NORTH PARK IMAGE								
VERY NEG	4.7%	9.7%	7.5%	5.3%	12.2%	25.3%	1.6%	1.9%
SOMEWT NEG	19.1%	20.8%	21.1%	20.3%	12.2%	25.3%	22.0%	14.2%
NEUTRAL	50.4%	42.9%	50.3%	47.1%	38.8%	31.9%	46.3%	55.5%
SOMEWHT POS	19.1%	21.4%	14.9%	23.0%	24.5%	13.2%	23.6%	21.3%
VERY POS	6.8%	5.2%	6.2%	4.3%	12.2%	4.4%	6.5%	7.1%
Q2.INTEREST IN NORTH PARK POLITICAL/SOCIAL								
NOT INTERESTED	4.7%	9.2%	10.6%	3.7%	2.0%	3.3%	6.5%	5.9%
NOT VERY INTER	20.4%	19.6%	21.9%	19.8%	16.3%	20.9%	22.8%	18.3%
INTERESTED	46.8%	54.2%	46.3%	54.0%	40.8%	49.5%	50.4%	49.0%
VERY INTERESTED	28.1%	17.0%	21.3%	22.5%	40.8%	26.4%	20.3%	26.8%
Q6.POLITICIANS DO WHAT IS IN BEST INTEREST								
STRONGLY DISAG	19.9%	29.5%	57.6%	1.1%	.0%	34.4%	19.2%	23.6%
SMWT DISAGREE	32.0%	28.2%	38.0%	31.1%	.0%	20.0%	35.0%	29.7%
SMWT AGREE	39.0%	36.9%	4.4%	66.1%	45.8%	37.8%	40.0%	37.8%
STRONGLY AGREE	9.1%	5.4%	.0%	1.6%	54.2%	7.8%	5.8%	8.8%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK								
NOTHING AT ALL	24.2%	29.9%	27.3%	28.3%	24.5%	29.7%	31.7%	21.3%
NOT MUCH	24.2%	19.5%	24.2%	20.3%	22.4%	19.8%	22.0%	21.9%
SOME	33.1%	33.8%	27.3%	39.0%	24.5%	27.5%	29.3%	38.7%
A GREAT DEAL	18.6%	16.9%	21.1%	12.3%	28.6%	23.1%	17.1%	18.1%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK								
NOTHING AT ALL	24.2%	29.9%	27.3%	28.3%	24.5%	29.7%	31.7%	21.3%
NOT MUCH	24.2%	19.5%	24.2%	20.3%	22.4%	19.8%	22.0%	21.9%
SOME	33.1%	33.8%	27.3%	39.0%	24.5%	27.5%	29.3%	38.7%
A GREAT DEAL	18.6%	16.9%	21.1%	12.3%	28.6%	23.1%	17.1%	18.1%
Q9.IV USERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD AFFECT Y								
NOT AT ALL	34.8%	31.6%	38.5%	27.3%	43.8%	31.5%	33.9%	38.3%
NOT MUCH	21.9%	24.3%	18.6%	26.8%	18.8%	11.2%	25.6%	26.0%
SOME	27.0%	28.3%	23.0%	33.9%	18.8%	32.6%	27.3%	25.3%
A GREAT DEAL	16.3%	15.8%	19.9%	12.0%	18.8%	24.7%	13.2%	10.4%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q10.ISSUE OF PRESENCE OF ID USERS								
NOT AN ISSUE	9.5%	9.9%	11.3%	8.2%	13.0%	13.8%	7.8%	9.2%
NOT VERY IMPRTNT	22.5%	14.8%	20.5%	21.3%	13.0%	10.3%	23.5%	23.0%
IMPORTANT	45.9%	41.5%	33.8%	50.8%	50.0%	36.8%	45.2%	48.7%
VERY IMPORTANT	22.1%	33.8%	34.4%	19.7%	23.9%	39.1%	23.5%	19.1%
Q11.CAN INFLUENCE INJECTION DRUG USE								
NOT AT ALL	28.6%	38.8%	39.1%	30.3%	23.4%	32.2%	31.4%	32.7%
NOT MUCH	30.3%	19.7%	19.3%	29.2%	36.2%	22.2%	28.9%	25.5%
SOME	35.0%	32.2%	30.4%	36.8%	34.0%	32.2%	32.2%	37.9%
A GREAT DEAL	6.0%	9.2%	11.2%	3.8%	6.4%	13.3%	7.4%	3.9%
Q15.AMOUNT HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM IN NORTH PARK								
NOTHING AT ALL	49.2%	58.4%	56.5%	50.3%	53.1%	54.9%	52.8%	53.5%
NOT MUCH	14.4%	11.0%	12.4%	13.9%	12.2%	14.3%	12.2%	11.0%
SOME	24.6%	22.1%	19.3%	27.8%	20.4%	19.8%	23.6%	24.5%
A GREAT DEAL	11.9%	8.4%	11.8%	8.0%	14.3%	11.0%	11.4%	11.0%
Q18.FAVOR/OPOSE PROGRAM BEING PERMANENT								
STR OPOSE	11.9%	18.2%	18.6%	11.2%	16.3%	50.5%	6.5%	1.3%
OPOSE	7.2%	3.2%	5.0%	6.4%	4.1%	12.1%	6.5%	.6%
NEUTRAL	18.6%	26.0%	23.0%	20.3%	20.4%	29.7%	22.0%	8.4%
FAVOR	27.5%	18.8%	19.3%	29.9%	22.4%	5.5%	42.3%	23.9%
STR FAVOR	34.7%	33.8%	34.2%	32.1%	36.7%	2.2%	22.8%	65.8%
Q19.ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PERMANENT PROGRAM								
NOT AT ALL	21.9%	26.8%	30.8%	20.0%	20.4%	35.2%	24.6%	15.9%
NOT MUCH	30.0%	22.8%	25.6%	29.2%	24.5%	22.7%	29.5%	26.5%
SOME	38.2%	41.6%	35.9%	43.8%	34.7%	30.7%	41.0%	45.0%
A GREAT DEAL	9.9%	8.7%	7.7%	7.0%	20.4%	11.4%	4.9%	12.6%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q20.VIEW OF PROGRAM CHANGED SINCE FEB 2003								
YES	13.3%	20.0%	17.5%	12.2%	22.7%	25.6%	10.5%	14.1%
NO	86.7%	80.0%	82.5%	87.8%	77.3%	74.4%	89.5%	85.9%
Q20A.CURRENT VIEW OF PROGRAM								
MORE POSITIVE	53.3%	41.7%	27.3%	54.5%	80.0%	20.0%	66.7%	70.0%
MORE NEGATIVE	40.0%	50.0%	63.6%	36.4%	20.0%	70.0%	16.7%	30.0%
MORE NEUTRAL	6.7%	8.3%	9.1%	9.1%	.0%	10.0%	16.7%	.0%
Q21A.KNOW PROGRAM MAIN LOCATION								
NO	88.1%	89.6%	87.6%	89.8%	87.8%	91.2%	87.0%	87.1%
CORRECT	11.9%	10.4%	12.4%	10.2%	12.2%	8.8%	13.0%	12.9%
Q21B.KNOW USE MOBILE VAN								
NO	83.5%	89.6%	86.3%	85.0%	89.8%	89.0%	87.8%	81.3%
MOBILE VAN	16.5%	10.4%	13.7%	15.0%	10.2%	11.0%	12.2%	18.7%
Q21C.KNOW OTHER SERVICES								
NO	89.0%	90.9%	91.3%	90.4%	83.7%	89.0%	92.7%	87.1%
YES	11.0%	9.1%	8.7%	9.6%	16.3%	11.0%	7.3%	12.9%
Q21E.PROGRAM IS ONE PLACE TO DISPOSE NEEDLES								
NO	41.1%	46.8%	47.2%	42.2%	40.8%	50.5%	45.5%	36.1%
TRUE	58.9%	53.2%	52.8%	57.8%	59.2%	49.5%	54.5%	63.9%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q22.PERSONALLY INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN								
PLANNING	.4%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
IMPLEMENTATION	.4%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
NO/NEITHER	99.1%	100.0%	100.0%	98.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.7%
Q22A.WHY NOT INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN								
DIDN'T KNOW	60.4%	59.7%	66.5%	55.6%	55.3%	60.9%	58.0%	62.4%
DIDN'T CARE	9.7%	14.8%	9.5%	12.4%	12.8%	12.6%	15.1%	6.7%
WOULDN'T MATTER	1.3%	2.0%	3.2%	.0%	2.1%	3.4%	1.7%	.7%
TOO BUSY/NO TIME	11.0%	10.1%	8.2%	12.4%	10.6%	5.7%	7.6%	16.1%
OTHER	17.6%	13.4%	12.7%	19.7%	19.1%	17.2%	17.6%	14.1%
Q23.SPOKE ABOUT PROGRAM TO OTHERS INVOLVED								
PLANNING	.9%	.6%	1.2%	.0%	2.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.3%
IMPLEMENTATION	1.3%	.6%	1.2%	.5%	2.0%	.0%	2.4%	.6%
BOTH	4.7%	.6%	3.1%	2.7%	4.1%	1.1%	4.9%	3.2%
NO/NEITHER	93.1%	98.1%	94.4%	96.7%	91.8%	97.8%	92.7%	94.8%
Q29. SPECIAL INTERESTS HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENC								
DISAGREE STR	10.6%	11.0%	14.3%	7.0%	14.3%	19.8%	8.1%	8.4%
DISAGREE	15.3%	25.3%	19.3%	19.8%	18.4%	17.6%	22.0%	20.0%
NEUTRAL	57.6%	57.1%	55.9%	62.6%	44.9%	50.5%	56.1%	58.7%
AGREE	11.0%	5.2%	7.5%	9.6%	8.2%	6.6%	12.2%	8.4%
AGREE STR	5.5%	1.3%	3.1%	1.1%	14.3%	5.5%	1.6%	4.5%
Q30.CAN TRUST OFFICIALS RUNNING PROGRAM								
DISAGREE STR	7.6%	8.4%	16.1%	1.1%	8.2%	19.8%	3.3%	5.2%
DISAGREE	11.4%	14.3%	14.9%	11.2%	10.2%	9.9%	13.8%	11.6%
NEUTRAL	23.7%	21.4%	24.2%	26.2%	12.2%	31.9%	24.4%	16.1%
AGREE	44.1%	44.2%	34.8%	49.7%	51.0%	31.9%	51.2%	45.8%
AGREE STR	13.1%	11.7%	9.9%	11.8%	18.4%	6.6%	7.3%	21.3%
Q31.ATTENDED COMMUNITY MEETINGS ON PROGRAM								
YES	4.3%	2.0%	5.0%	1.1%	6.3%	4.4%	3.3%	2.6%
NO	95.7%	98.0%	95.0%	98.9%	93.8%	95.6%	96.7%	97.4%
Q31A.MEETINGS PROVIDED MEANINGFUL DISCUSS OF								
YES	90.0%	66.7%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	75.0%	100.0%
NO	10.0%	33.3%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%
Q32.PUBLIC WAS ASKED ABOUT VIEWS OF PROGRAM								
YES	27.7%	15.4%	9.4%	29.7%	41.7%	19.4%	21.5%	28.6%
NO	72.3%	84.6%	90.6%	70.3%	58.3%	80.6%	78.5%	71.4%
EDUCATION								
0-12	19.1%	27.3%	30.4%	15.6%	24.5%	36.3%	16.4%	16.8%
13-16	31.4%	33.8%	32.9%	34.4%	24.5%	30.8%	28.7%	33.5%
17+	49.6%	39.0%	36.6%	50.0%	51.0%	33.0%	54.9%	49.7%
LATINO								
NO	80.1%	77.3%	79.5%	80.7%	69.4%	73.6%	76.4%	87.7%
LATINO	19.9%	22.7%	20.5%	19.3%	30.6%	26.4%	23.6%	12.3%
RACE								
CAUCASIAN	63.3%	59.6%	60.6%	65.9%	51.1%	57.5%	59.8%	71.8%
AFR-AMER	5.2%	7.5%	8.4%	5.6%	.0%	6.9%	4.3%	6.0%
HISPANIC	20.5%	24.0%	21.3%	20.1%	31.9%	27.6%	24.8%	12.8%
ASIAN	1.3%	2.1%	.6%	2.8%	2.1%	1.1%	1.7%	2.7%
OTHER	9.6%	6.8%	9.0%	5.6%	14.9%	6.9%	9.4%	6.7%
PARTY								
REPUBLICAN	19.3%	8.3%	13.9%	14.9%	22.2%	34.4%	14.3%	6.3%
INDEP	26.1%	37.0%	38.6%	28.4%	16.7%	31.3%	27.5%	33.0%
DEMOCRAT	54.5%	54.6%	47.5%	56.8%	61.1%	34.4%	58.2%	60.7%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
IDEOLOGY								
CONSERVATIVE	19.6%	13.2%	15.9%	16.1%	28.9%	38.2%	12.6%	9.9%
MID ROAD	35.7%	49.0%	45.9%	36.6%	40.0%	43.8%	41.2%	33.1%
LIBERAL	44.8%	37.7%	38.2%	47.3%	31.1%	18.0%	46.2%	57.0%
Q45.RELIGIOUS FAITH								
PROTESTANT	18.8%	23.2%	18.8%	22.8%	23.4%	27.8%	16.0%	20.8%
CATHOLIC	27.4%	31.1%	33.8%	22.8%	34.0%	41.1%	30.3%	18.8%
JEWISH	3.0%	.7%	.6%	2.7%	4.3%	1.1%	1.7%	3.2%
MUSLIM	.4%	.7%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%
BUDDHIST	3.0%	2.6%	3.8%	2.2%	2.1%	1.1%	3.4%	3.2%
OTHER	20.5%	19.2%	18.8%	21.2%	19.1%	16.7%	21.8%	18.8%
NONE	26.9%	22.5%	23.1%	28.3%	17.0%	12.2%	26.1%	35.1%
Q46.FREQUENCY ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES								
ONCE A WEEK	20.9%	27.3%	27.0%	20.7%	19.1%	37.8%	19.2%	17.0%
ONCE A MONTH	9.8%	10.0%	9.4%	9.8%	10.6%	11.1%	9.2%	7.8%
SEVERAL TIMES/YR	22.2%	24.7%	20.8%	24.5%	27.7%	27.8%	23.3%	19.6%
ONCE A YEAR/LESS	9.4%	10.0%	6.9%	11.4%	12.8%	5.6%	12.5%	11.1%
NOT AT ALL	37.6%	28.0%	35.8%	33.7%	29.8%	17.8%	35.8%	44.4%
Q49.EVER USED SYRINGES OR IV NEEDLES								
YES	17.4%	14.3%	15.0%	15.5%	18.4%	14.3%	13.1%	20.6%
NO	82.6%	85.7%	85.0%	84.5%	81.6%	85.7%	86.9%	79.4%
GENDER								
MALE	50.0%	49.4%	48.4%	50.3%	55.1%	51.6%	51.2%	51.6%
FEMALE	50.0%	50.6%	51.6%	49.7%	44.9%	48.4%	48.8%	48.4%
Q3_1.LEARN COMMUNITY EVENTS: COMMUNITY MEETINGS								
NOT AT ALL	60.2%	62.3%	61.5%	63.6%	51.0%	54.9%	65.9%	60.6%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.5%	26.0%	29.8%	23.5%	28.6%	33.0%	23.6%	25.2%
DK	.0%	.6%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
OFTEN	8.5%	7.8%	4.3%	10.2%	14.3%	6.6%	9.8%	8.4%
VERY OFTEN	3.8%	3.2%	4.3%	2.1%	6.1%	5.5%	.8%	5.2%
Q3_2.NEWSPAPERS								
NOT AT ALL	12.7%	15.6%	19.3%	11.8%	8.2%	19.8%	10.6%	14.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	24.6%	22.1%	22.4%	26.7%	14.3%	14.3%	26.8%	25.2%
DK	.0%	.6%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
OFTEN	39.4%	43.5%	36.6%	44.4%	42.9%	41.8%	45.5%	38.1%
VERY OFTEN	23.3%	18.2%	21.7%	16.6%	34.7%	24.2%	17.1%	21.9%
Q3_3.COMMUNITY NEWSLE								
NOT AT ALL	17.8%	22.1%	24.2%	16.6%	16.3%	18.7%	23.6%	17.4%
NOT VERY OFTEN	26.7%	31.2%	29.8%	31.6%	14.3%	29.7%	22.0%	31.6%
OFTEN	38.1%	33.8%	32.3%	38.5%	38.8%	34.1%	38.2%	35.5%
VERY OFTEN	17.4%	13.0%	13.7%	13.4%	30.6%	17.6%	16.3%	15.5%
Q3_4.POSTERS								
NOT AT ALL	22.0%	25.3%	23.6%	24.1%	22.4%	25.3%	24.4%	23.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	36.4%	32.5%	35.4%	33.7%	38.8%	40.7%	33.3%	32.3%
DK	.4%	.6%	.0%	.5%	2.0%	.0%	.8%	.6%
OFTEN	33.1%	33.8%	30.4%	36.4%	28.6%	26.4%	32.5%	36.8%
VERY OFTEN	8.1%	7.8%	10.6%	5.3%	8.2%	7.7%	8.9%	6.5%
Q3_4.POSTERS								
NOT AT ALL	22.0%	25.3%	23.6%	24.1%	22.4%	25.3%	24.4%	23.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	36.4%	32.5%	35.4%	33.7%	38.8%	40.7%	33.3%	32.3%
DK	.4%	.6%	.0%	.5%	2.0%	.0%	.8%	.6%
OFTEN	33.1%	33.8%	30.4%	36.4%	28.6%	26.4%	32.5%	36.8%
VERY OFTEN	8.1%	7.8%	10.6%	5.3%	8.2%	7.7%	8.9%	6.5%
Q3_5.RADIO								
NOT AT ALL	29.7%	36.4%	34.8%	33.2%	28.6%	27.5%	37.4%	33.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	38.6%	34.4%	32.9%	38.5%	40.8%	34.1%	39.0%	36.8%
DK	.0%	.6%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
OFTEN	24.2%	21.4%	22.4%	23.0%	22.4%	30.8%	16.3%	23.2%
VERY OFTEN	7.6%	7.1%	9.9%	4.8%	8.2%	7.7%	7.3%	5.8%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q3 6.TV								
NOT AT ALL	28.8%	28.6%	31.1%	24.6%	32.7%	20.9%	25.2%	35.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	39.8%	34.4%	34.8%	41.7%	32.7%	30.8%	46.3%	36.1%
OFTEN	23.7%	22.1%	22.4%	24.6%	20.4%	27.5%	18.7%	23.2%
VERY OFTEN	7.6%	14.9%	11.8%	9.1%	14.3%	20.9%	9.8%	5.2%
Q3 7.FAMILY MEMBERS								
NOT AT ALL	51.7%	59.1%	57.8%	53.5%	53.1%	59.3%	55.3%	54.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	20.8%	18.8%	17.4%	24.6%	12.2%	19.8%	15.4%	23.2%
DK	.8%	.0%	.6%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
OFTEN	22.5%	17.5%	18.0%	20.9%	20.4%	13.2%	27.6%	17.4%
VERY OFTEN	4.2%	4.5%	6.2%	1.1%	12.2%	7.7%	1.6%	4.5%
Q3 8.FRIENDS/NEIGHBOR								
NOT AT ALL	17.4%	19.5%	25.5%	16.0%	10.2%	20.9%	22.0%	14.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	30.9%	31.2%	26.1%	35.3%	28.6%	27.5%	26.0%	38.1%
DK	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
OFTEN	36.4%	37.7%	36.0%	38.0%	28.6%	36.3%	39.0%	34.2%
VERY OFTEN	14.8%	11.7%	12.4%	10.7%	30.6%	15.4%	13.0%	12.9%
Q3 9.PEOPLE AT WORK/S								
NOT AT ALL	44.1%	48.1%	47.8%	46.0%	36.7%	41.8%	43.9%	50.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	29.7%	24.0%	21.7%	30.5%	36.7%	26.4%	31.7%	23.9%
DK	.0%	.6%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%
OFTEN	20.3%	20.8%	19.9%	20.9%	22.4%	22.0%	21.1%	20.0%
VERY OFTEN	5.9%	6.5%	9.9%	2.7%	4.1%	9.9%	3.3%	5.2%
Q3 10.POLITICIANS/PUBL								
NOT AT ALL	40.3%	44.2%	48.4%	38.0%	30.6%	42.9%	41.5%	39.4%
NOT VERY OFTEN	36.9%	40.9%	36.0%	43.3%	32.7%	35.2%	40.7%	40.0%
DK	.4%	1.3%	1.2%	.5%	.0%	1.1%	.8%	.6%
OFTEN	17.4%	10.4%	11.2%	13.9%	24.5%	13.2%	13.8%	14.8%
VERY OFTEN	5.1%	3.2%	3.1%	4.3%	12.2%	7.7%	3.3%	5.2%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q14 1.PROGRAMS: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE								
DISAGREE STR	11.9%	10.4%	8.1%	12.3%	14.3%	4.4%	4.1%	21.3%
DISAGREE	40.7%	37.0%	35.4%	41.2%	42.9%	15.4%	39.0%	55.5%
NEUTRAL	6.8%	13.6%	9.3%	12.3%	2.0%	3.3%	19.5%	4.5%
AGREE	28.0%	26.6%	31.7%	24.1%	24.5%	35.2%	34.1%	15.5%
AGREE STR	12.7%	12.3%	15.5%	10.2%	16.3%	41.8%	3.3%	3.2%
Q14 2.ATTRACT DRUG DEALERS								
DISAGREE STR	10.2%	12.3%	8.1%	11.2%	18.4%	5.5%	1.6%	23.2%
DISAGREE	39.8%	29.9%	32.9%	40.1%	24.5%	8.8%	41.5%	49.0%
NEUTRAL	11.4%	9.1%	11.8%	11.8%	4.1%	4.4%	22.0%	6.5%
AGREE	24.2%	35.1%	24.2%	30.5%	34.7%	45.1%	26.0%	14.2%
AGREE STR	14.4%	13.6%	23.0%	6.4%	18.4%	36.3%	8.9%	7.1%
Q14 3.LOWER PROPERTY VALUES								
DISAGREE STR	11.9%	9.7%	8.7%	10.2%	20.4%	7.7%	1.6%	21.3%
DISAGREE	36.4%	31.2%	32.9%	34.8%	30.6%	14.3%	40.7%	39.4%
NEUTRAL	11.9%	11.0%	13.0%	11.2%	10.2%	8.8%	17.9%	9.0%
AGREE	27.5%	35.7%	26.7%	35.8%	28.6%	35.2%	35.0%	25.8%
AGREE STR	12.3%	12.3%	18.6%	8.0%	10.2%	34.1%	4.9%	4.5%
Q14 4.REDUCE PUBLIC COSTS OF HIV/AIDS								
DISAGREE STR	28.0%	29.2%	21.1%	32.1%	34.7%	12.1%	13.0%	52.9%
DISAGREE	46.2%	37.7%	41.0%	44.9%	42.9%	31.9%	64.2%	32.9%
NEUTRAL	4.7%	12.3%	9.3%	7.5%	4.1%	11.0%	8.9%	4.5%
AGREE	16.1%	13.6%	19.9%	11.2%	12.2%	29.7%	13.0%	5.2%
AGREE STR	5.1%	7.1%	8.7%	4.3%	6.1%	15.4%	.8%	4.5%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q14 5. REDUCE COMMUNICABLE DISEASE								
DISAGREE STR	31.8%	32.5%	31.1%	33.2%	32.7%	8.8%	17.9%	61.9%
DISAGREE	47.9%	43.5%	39.1%	48.7%	51.0%	40.7%	68.3%	27.7%
NEUTRAL	3.4%	4.5%	4.3%	4.8%	2.0%	3.3%	6.5%	1.9%
AGREE	11.9%	13.0%	15.5%	10.2%	10.2%	26.4%	7.3%	5.2%
AGREE STR	5.1%	6.5%	9.9%	3.2%	4.1%	20.9%	.0%	3.2%
Q14 6. DECREASE CRIME								
DISAGREE STR	6.8%	6.5%	5.0%	6.4%	16.3%	4.4%	2.4%	12.9%
DISAGREE	25.8%	21.4%	21.1%	25.7%	26.5%	11.0%	30.9%	27.7%
NEUTRAL	14.0%	14.3%	15.5%	16.0%	6.1%	5.5%	21.1%	14.2%
AGREE	42.4%	41.6%	41.6%	41.7%	36.7%	38.5%	42.3%	39.4%
AGREE STR	11.0%	16.2%	16.8%	10.2%	14.3%	40.7%	3.3%	5.8%
Q14 7. INCREASE COMMUNITY CONFLICT								
DISAGREE STR	4.7%	9.1%	5.0%	5.3%	12.2%	3.3%	3.3%	10.3%
DISAGREE	28.0%	29.9%	26.1%	31.6%	24.5%	6.6%	29.3%	42.6%
NEUTRAL	8.1%	3.9%	3.7%	9.6%	8.2%	4.4%	8.9%	6.5%
AGREE	43.2%	37.0%	37.9%	42.2%	42.9%	47.3%	45.5%	32.3%
AGREE STR	16.1%	20.1%	27.3%	11.2%	12.2%	38.5%	13.0%	8.4%
Q14 8. ATTRACT HOMELESS								
DISAGREE STR	8.5%	7.1%	5.6%	8.6%	14.3%	6.6%	.8%	16.1%
DISAGREE	36.4%	35.1%	32.9%	36.9%	34.7%	18.7%	46.3%	40.0%
NEUTRAL	7.6%	7.1%	7.5%	9.1%	2.0%	5.5%	8.9%	6.5%
AGREE	33.1%	35.7%	33.5%	36.9%	26.5%	34.1%	37.4%	28.4%
AGREE STR	14.4%	14.9%	20.5%	8.6%	22.4%	35.2%	6.5%	9.0%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A 1. HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM: COMMUNITY MEETINGS								
NOT AT ALL	65.0%	66.7%	55.1%	75.3%	60.9%	48.8%	66.7%	72.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	21.7%	20.6%	27.5%	15.1%	26.1%	39.0%	19.3%	12.5%
OFTEN	9.2%	11.1%	14.5%	7.5%	4.3%	9.8%	12.3%	9.7%
VERY OFTEN	4.2%	1.6%	2.9%	2.2%	8.7%	2.4%	1.8%	5.6%
Q15A 2. NEWSPAPERS								
NOT AT ALL	29.4%	31.3%	38.6%	26.1%	21.7%	27.5%	29.3%	26.4%
NOT VERY OFTEN	36.1%	34.4%	28.6%	41.3%	30.4%	45.0%	31.0%	36.1%
OFTEN	22.7%	21.9%	22.9%	22.8%	21.7%	20.0%	29.3%	23.6%
VERY OFTEN	11.8%	12.5%	10.0%	9.8%	26.1%	7.5%	10.3%	13.9%
Q15A 3. COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER								
NOT AT ALL	32.5%	41.3%	34.8%	38.7%	21.7%	34.1%	27.6%	38.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	36.7%	17.5%	34.8%	26.9%	26.1%	31.7%	32.8%	23.9%
OFTEN	23.3%	30.2%	20.3%	30.1%	30.4%	26.8%	32.8%	26.8%
VERY OFTEN	7.5%	11.1%	10.1%	4.3%	21.7%	7.3%	6.9%	11.3%
Q15A 4. POSTERS								
NOT AT ALL	67.2%	78.1%	67.1%	72.8%	78.3%	72.5%	67.2%	77.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	24.4%	15.6%	28.6%	17.4%	13.0%	22.5%	20.7%	15.3%
OFTEN	7.6%	6.3%	4.3%	9.8%	4.3%	5.0%	12.1%	5.6%
VERY OFTEN	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	.0%	1.4%
Q15A 5. RADIO								
NOT AT ALL	63.0%	65.6%	64.3%	65.2%	60.9%	50.0%	70.7%	69.4%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.7%	18.8%	25.7%	21.7%	30.4%	35.0%	19.0%	22.2%
OFTEN	7.6%	15.6%	8.6%	12.0%	8.7%	15.0%	10.3%	8.3%
VERY OFTEN	1.7%	.0%	1.4%	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A 6.TV								
NOT AT ALL	44.9%	46.9%	51.4%	38.5%	56.5%	33.3%	51.7%	48.6%
NOT VERY OFTEN	39.8%	35.9%	35.7%	41.8%	34.8%	46.2%	36.2%	34.7%
OFTEN	10.2%	17.2%	7.1%	17.6%	8.7%	20.5%	8.6%	12.5%
VERY OFTEN	5.1%	.0%	5.7%	2.2%	.0%	.0%	3.4%	4.2%
Q15A 7.FAMILY MEMBERS								
NOT AT ALL	72.0%	77.8%	72.1%	76.3%	68.2%	72.5%	67.2%	84.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.8%	12.7%	17.6%	16.1%	9.1%	17.5%	17.2%	11.3%
OFTEN	5.1%	4.8%	2.9%	6.5%	4.5%	5.0%	6.9%	1.4%
VERY OFTEN	5.1%	4.8%	7.4%	1.1%	18.2%	5.0%	8.6%	2.8%
Q15A 8.FRIENDS/NEIGHBORS								
NOT AT ALL	37.5%	48.4%	37.1%	45.2%	43.5%	41.5%	37.9%	47.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	23.3%	29.7%	30.0%	25.8%	8.7%	26.8%	27.6%	20.8%
OFTEN	28.3%	10.9%	21.4%	21.5%	26.1%	19.5%	27.6%	19.4%
VERY OFTEN	10.8%	10.9%	11.4%	7.5%	21.7%	12.2%	6.9%	12.5%
Q15A 9.PEOPLE AT WORK/SCHOOL								
NOT AT ALL	66.7%	66.7%	69.6%	63.4%	73.9%	58.5%	71.9%	68.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	16.7%	14.3%	13.0%	20.4%	4.3%	19.5%	15.8%	12.5%
OFTEN	14.2%	7.9%	10.1%	10.8%	21.7%	14.6%	7.0%	13.9%
VERY OFTEN	2.5%	11.1%	7.2%	5.4%	.0%	7.3%	5.3%	5.6%
Q15A 10.POLITICIANS/PUBLIC								
NOT AT ALL	36.7%	52.4%	47.1%	42.4%	26.1%	36.6%	49.1%	31.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	38.3%	33.3%	40.0%	33.7%	39.1%	48.8%	31.6%	38.9%
OFTEN	16.7%	9.5%	7.1%	18.5%	17.4%	12.2%	12.3%	18.1%
VERY OFTEN	8.3%	4.8%	5.7%	5.4%	17.4%	2.4%	7.0%	11.1%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27 1.CONSEQUENCES: INCREASE NUMBER NEEDLES								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	18.6%	17.5%	19.9%	16.0%	18.4%	9.9%	17.1%	26.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	41.9%	40.3%	36.6%	48.1%	24.5%	33.0%	39.8%	48.4%
DK	6.8%	4.5%	6.8%	5.3%	8.2%	6.6%	7.3%	3.9%
LIKELY	16.5%	15.6%	14.3%	16.0%	22.4%	20.9%	23.6%	7.7%
VERY LIKELY	16.1%	22.1%	22.4%	14.4%	26.5%	29.7%	12.2%	13.5%
Q27 2.DECREASE INJECTION DRUG USE								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	19.1%	15.6%	24.2%	12.8%	20.4%	33.0%	13.0%	12.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	38.1%	40.3%	40.4%	41.2%	22.4%	47.3%	40.7%	33.5%
DK	6.4%	4.5%	6.8%	5.9%	2.0%	3.3%	8.1%	4.5%
LIKELY	25.0%	27.3%	19.3%	29.9%	30.6%	12.1%	29.3%	31.6%
VERY LIKELY	11.4%	12.3%	9.3%	10.2%	24.5%	4.4%	8.9%	18.1%
Q27 3.THREATEN SAFETY OF CHILDREN								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	21.6%	13.0%	17.4%	16.0%	24.5%	7.7%	11.4%	31.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	37.7%	38.3%	29.8%	46.5%	26.5%	19.8%	44.7%	43.9%
DK	7.6%	7.8%	10.6%	7.5%	2.0%	4.4%	9.8%	8.4%
LIKELY	19.1%	21.4%	23.0%	18.2%	20.4%	34.1%	22.0%	8.4%
VERY LIKELY	14.0%	19.5%	19.3%	11.8%	26.5%	34.1%	12.2%	8.4%
Q27 4.ATTRACT CRIME								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	10.6%	11.0%	12.4%	9.1%	10.2%	3.3%	6.5%	20.6%
NOT VERY LIKELY	45.8%	37.0%	33.5%	49.2%	38.8%	16.5%	49.6%	54.2%
DK	8.9%	7.8%	9.3%	9.6%	4.1%	3.3%	12.2%	7.7%
LIKELY	23.3%	26.6%	24.8%	22.5%	30.6%	39.6%	25.2%	12.9%
VERY LIKELY	11.4%	17.5%	19.9%	9.6%	16.3%	37.4%	6.5%	4.5%
Q27 5.BRING COMMUNITY TOGETHER								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	7.6%	9.1%	11.2%	4.8%	8.2%	15.4%	7.3%	4.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	29.2%	29.2%	36.6%	25.7%	18.4%	35.2%	35.8%	24.5%
DK	7.2%	4.5%	5.0%	8.0%	4.1%	4.4%	4.9%	7.1%
LIKELY	39.0%	37.0%	29.2%	45.5%	40.8%	28.6%	40.7%	38.7%
VERY LIKELY	16.9%	20.1%	18.0%	16.0%	28.6%	16.5%	11.4%	25.2%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27_6.LEAD USERS TO SEEK ADDICTION HELP								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	6.8%	9.1%	9.3%	7.5%	4.1%	20.9%	.8%	4.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	21.6%	22.7%	24.2%	19.8%	22.4%	35.2%	25.2%	14.2%
DK	11.0%	7.1%	8.1%	12.3%	8.2%	6.6%	9.8%	10.3%
LIKELY	39.0%	34.4%	34.8%	43.3%	20.4%	24.2%	43.1%	40.6%
VERY LIKELY	21.6%	26.6%	23.6%	17.1%	44.9%	13.2%	21.1%	30.3%
Q27_7.LEAD USERS TO SEEK HIV/AIDS HELP								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	5.5%	7.1%	8.1%	5.3%	4.1%	17.6%	3.3%	1.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	15.3%	20.8%	23.0%	14.4%	8.2%	27.5%	17.1%	11.0%
DK	9.7%	8.4%	10.6%	9.6%	6.1%	11.0%	8.9%	9.0%
LIKELY	42.8%	37.7%	36.0%	47.1%	32.7%	30.8%	46.3%	43.9%
VERY LIKELY	26.7%	26.0%	22.4%	23.5%	49.0%	13.2%	24.4%	34.8%
Q27_8.INCREASE ADDICTION IN AREA								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	22.9%	17.5%	19.9%	22.5%	14.3%	4.4%	16.3%	34.8%
NOT VERY LIKELY	42.4%	39.6%	34.2%	46.0%	40.8%	26.4%	44.7%	49.0%
DK	7.6%	9.1%	11.2%	8.6%	2.0%	7.7%	11.4%	5.8%
LIKELY	16.1%	16.2%	18.0%	12.8%	22.4%	26.4%	19.5%	6.5%
VERY LIKELY	11.0%	17.5%	16.8%	10.2%	20.4%	35.2%	8.1%	3.9%
Q27_9.REDUCE SPREAD HIV/AIDS IN AREA								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	5.5%	2.6%	5.0%	4.8%	4.1%	9.9%	4.1%	3.2%
NOT VERY LIKELY	9.7%	18.8%	19.3%	10.7%	6.1%	35.2%	6.5%	7.1%
DK	4.2%	5.2%	6.2%	2.7%	8.2%	5.5%	4.9%	1.9%
LIKELY	37.7%	32.5%	34.2%	39.6%	26.5%	27.5%	48.8%	30.3%
VERY LIKELY	42.8%	40.9%	35.4%	42.2%	55.1%	22.0%	35.8%	57.4%
Q27_10.REDUCE SPREAD HEP C IN AREA								
NOT AT ALL LKLY	4.2%	3.2%	4.3%	3.7%	6.1%	11.0%	2.4%	1.9%
NOT VERY LIKELY	12.3%	15.6%	16.1%	12.3%	10.2%	33.0%	8.1%	6.5%
DK	4.7%	5.8%	6.2%	4.3%	4.1%	6.6%	5.7%	3.2%
LIKELY	32.2%	31.8%	27.3%	38.5%	26.5%	24.2%	40.7%	29.7%
VERY LIKELY	46.6%	43.5%	46.0%	41.2%	53.1%	25.3%	43.1%	58.7%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_1.PROGRAM: IN NORTH PARK BECAUSE USERS ARE THERE								
NO	65.7%	66.2%	70.2%	64.2%	63.3%	70.3%	63.4%	63.9%
TRUE	34.3%	33.8%	29.8%	35.8%	36.7%	29.7%	36.6%	36.1%
Q28_2.PARENTS AFRAID LET KIDS PLAY OUTSIDE								
NO	77.5%	72.1%	70.2%	80.2%	67.3%	56.0%	80.5%	83.9%
TRUE	22.5%	27.9%	29.8%	19.8%	32.7%	44.0%	19.5%	16.1%
Q28_3.OFFICIALS DON T LISTEN TO CITIZENS								
NO	80.5%	77.9%	75.8%	83.4%	79.6%	67.0%	80.5%	89.0%
TRUE	19.5%	22.1%	24.2%	16.6%	20.4%	33.0%	19.5%	11.0%
Q28_4.CITIZENS NOT INTERESTED PROVIDING INPUT								
NO	64.0%	73.4%	68.9%	68.4%	63.3%	74.7%	69.1%	60.6%
TRUE	36.0%	26.6%	31.1%	31.6%	36.7%	25.3%	30.9%	39.4%
Q28_5.REASON PEOPLE WON T LIVE IN NORTH PARK								
NO	91.5%	89.6%	89.4%	93.6%	79.6%	78.0%	95.1%	94.8%
TRUE	8.5%	10.4%	10.6%	6.4%	20.4%	22.0%	4.9%	5.2%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_6.DISTRIBUTED NEEDLES ARE MONITORED								
NO	55.5%	60.4%	59.0%	57.8%	55.1%	68.1%	61.8%	46.5%
TRUE	44.5%	39.6%	41.0%	42.2%	44.9%	31.9%	38.2%	53.5%
Q28_7.PROVIDED IMMEDIATE REFERRALS								
NO	72.5%	73.4%	72.0%	77.5%	59.2%	85.7%	74.0%	61.9%
TRUE	27.5%	26.6%	28.0%	22.5%	40.8%	14.3%	26.0%	38.1%
Q28_8.CITY NOTIFIED CITIZENS DURING PLANNING								
NO	84.7%	84.4%	87.6%	84.5%	77.6%	82.4%	84.6%	83.9%
TRUE	15.3%	15.6%	12.4%	15.5%	22.4%	17.6%	15.4%	16.1%
Q28_9.CITIZENS HAVE INFLUENCE OVER OPERATION								
NO	43.2%	46.8%	57.1%	36.9%	34.7%	54.9%	49.6%	32.3%
TRUE	56.8%	53.2%	42.9%	63.1%	65.3%	45.1%	50.4%	67.7%
Q28_10.RESIDENTS COULD PARTICIPATE IMPLEMENTATION								
NO	71.6%	74.0%	82.6%	66.3%	65.3%	80.2%	78.0%	61.9%
TRUE	28.4%	26.0%	17.4%	33.7%	34.7%	19.8%	22.0%	38.1%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_11.I HEARD ABOUT PUBLIC FORUM ON PROGRAM								
NO	81.8%	87.7%	88.2%	83.4%	73.5%	89.0%	85.4%	79.4%
TRUE	18.2%	12.3%	11.8%	16.6%	26.5%	11.0%	14.6%	20.6%
Q28_12.MOST CITIZENS KNOW LITTLE ABOUT PROGRAM								
NO	20.8%	17.5%	16.1%	21.9%	22.4%	17.6%	24.4%	16.1%
TRUE	79.2%	82.5%	83.9%	78.1%	77.6%	82.4%	75.6%	83.9%
Q28_13.BUSINESSES PAID SO WON'T OPPOSE								
NO	92.8%	95.5%	94.4%	94.7%	89.8%	95.6%	95.1%	92.9%
TRUE	7.2%	4.5%	5.6%	5.3%	10.2%	4.4%	4.9%	7.1%
Q28_14.CITY COUNCIL SHOWN RESPECT FOR CITIZENS								
NO	69.5%	78.6%	85.7%	69.5%	51.0%	80.2%	77.2%	66.5%
TRUE	30.5%	21.4%	14.3%	30.5%	49.0%	19.8%	22.8%	33.5%
Q28_15.WEALTHIER NEIGHBORHOODS DID NOT WANT								
NO	61.9%	59.1%	58.4%	61.5%	67.3%	62.6%	58.5%	61.3%
TRUE	38.1%	40.9%	41.6%	38.5%	32.7%	37.4%	41.5%	38.7%
Q28_16.POLICE RESPONSE ADEQUATE TO NP								
NO	70.8%	70.8%	78.3%	71.1%	51.0%	71.4%	77.2%	67.1%
TRUE	29.2%	29.2%	21.7%	28.9%	49.0%	28.6%	22.8%	32.9%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q33_1.SUPPORT LOCATION: MEDICAL BUILDING								
NO	17.8%	16.9%	18.6%	16.0%	24.5%	51.6%	7.3%	7.1%
YES	82.2%	83.1%	81.4%	84.0%	75.5%	48.4%	92.7%	92.9%
Q33_2.PERMANENT BUILDING								
NO	22.5%	27.3%	24.8%	24.6%	24.5%	52.7%	18.7%	12.3%
YES	77.5%	72.7%	75.2%	75.4%	75.5%	47.3%	81.3%	87.7%
Q33_3.AWAY FROM SCHOOLS								
NO	19.9%	19.5%	21.1%	17.6%	28.6%	50.5%	10.6%	9.7%
YES	80.1%	80.5%	78.9%	82.4%	71.4%	49.5%	89.4%	90.3%
Q33_4.AWAY FROM HOMES								
NO	21.2%	23.4%	24.8%	19.8%	28.6%	51.6%	14.6%	12.3%
YES	78.8%	76.6%	75.2%	80.2%	71.4%	48.4%	85.4%	87.7%
Q33_5.ON OWN BLOCK								
NO	62.3%	60.4%	66.5%	59.9%	59.2%	92.3%	63.4%	40.0%
YES	37.7%	39.6%	33.5%	40.1%	40.8%	7.7%	36.6%	60.0%
Q33_6.FAR FROM HOME								
NO	27.1%	33.1%	31.7%	26.7%	40.8%	59.3%	23.6%	20.0%
YES	72.9%	66.9%	68.3%	73.3%	59.2%	40.7%	76.4%	80.0%
Q33_7.NEXT DOOR/ACROSS STREET								
NO	73.7%	70.8%	73.3%	73.8%	69.4%	94.5%	73.2%	56.8%
YES	26.3%	29.2%	26.7%	26.2%	30.6%	5.5%	26.8%	43.2%
Q33_8.LOCATED OUTSIDE NORTH PARK								
NO	31.8%	33.1%	32.3%	32.1%	40.8%	64.8%	22.0%	22.6%
YES	68.2%	66.9%	67.7%	67.9%	59.2%	35.2%	78.0%	77.4%
Q34_1.POL PARTICIPATION-VOTE FOR PRESIDENT								
NOT AT ALL	14.0%	21.7%	24.5%	12.9%	12.5%	23.3%	19.7%	9.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	2.6%	2.6%	2.5%	2.7%	2.1%	3.3%	.8%	2.6%
OFTEN	21.3%	18.4%	18.2%	19.9%	25.0%	15.6%	21.3%	19.6%
VERY OFTEN	62.1%	57.2%	54.7%	64.5%	60.4%	57.8%	58.2%	68.0%
Q34_2.VOTE FOR CITY COUNCIL								
NOT AT ALL	17.0%	28.8%	23.8%	19.4%	25.0%	29.7%	24.6%	13.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	11.1%	7.8%	11.9%	9.1%	4.2%	8.8%	8.2%	11.1%
OFTEN	27.7%	20.3%	23.8%	24.7%	25.0%	19.8%	28.7%	24.2%
VERY OFTEN	44.3%	43.1%	40.6%	46.8%	45.8%	41.8%	38.5%	51.6%
Q34_3.VOTE IN PRIMARIES								
NOT AT ALL	13.6%	24.2%	23.1%	14.5%	16.7%	22.0%	21.3%	11.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	6.4%	3.9%	6.3%	5.4%	2.1%	5.5%	4.1%	5.9%
OFTEN	24.7%	20.3%	20.6%	24.7%	22.9%	23.1%	27.9%	18.3%
VERY OFTEN	55.3%	51.6%	50.0%	55.4%	58.3%	49.5%	46.7%	64.1%
Q34_4.CONTACT COUNCILMEN								
NOT AT ALL	48.1%	61.7%	57.8%	51.6%	52.1%	61.5%	54.9%	42.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.5%	27.3%	25.5%	34.4%	8.3%	23.1%	24.6%	36.4%
OFTEN	16.6%	7.8%	11.2%	11.8%	22.9%	9.9%	16.4%	13.0%
VERY OFTEN	6.8%	3.2%	5.6%	2.2%	16.7%	5.5%	4.1%	7.8%
Q34_5.ATTEND NEIGHBORHOOD MTGS								
NOT AT ALL	46.4%	57.1%	57.1%	47.8%	37.5%	52.7%	49.2%	46.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	33.6%	27.9%	27.3%	36.6%	27.1%	29.7%	35.2%	31.8%
OFTEN	16.2%	13.0%	13.7%	12.9%	27.1%	15.4%	13.1%	16.9%
VERY OFTEN	3.8%	1.9%	1.9%	2.7%	8.3%	2.2%	2.5%	4.5%
Q34_6.TALK OTHERS ABOUT ISSUES								
NOT AT ALL	19.1%	29.9%	28.0%	20.4%	20.8%	28.6%	25.4%	13.0%
NOT VERY OFTEN	27.7%	24.7%	21.1%	33.3%	18.8%	25.3%	27.0%	29.9%
OFTEN	33.6%	28.6%	31.7%	28.5%	39.6%	25.3%	28.7%	38.3%
VERY OFTEN	19.6%	16.9%	19.3%	17.7%	20.8%	20.9%	18.9%	18.8%

Proximity, Trust/efficacy, Support Idea of Exchanges

	DISTANCE TO PROGRAM		POLITICAL TRUST/EFFICACY			NEEDLE EXCHANGE EVALUATION		
	7+ BLOCKS	0-6 BLOCKS	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	OPPOSE	NEUTRAL	SUPPORT
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q34_7.ROLE IN COUNCIL CAMPAIGN								
NOT AT ALL	64.3%	75.3%	72.7%	69.9%	50.0%	62.6%	75.4%	64.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	23.4%	17.5%	18.6%	22.0%	25.0%	25.3%	15.6%	25.3%
OFTEN	8.1%	2.6%	3.7%	4.8%	14.6%	3.3%	7.4%	5.2%
VERY OFTEN	4.3%	4.5%	5.0%	3.2%	10.4%	8.8%	1.6%	4.5%
Q34_8.GIVE MONEY COUNCIL CAMPAIGN								
NOT AT ALL	70.1%	75.8%	79.4%	72.4%	47.9%	74.4%	74.4%	68.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	20.1%	17.6%	12.5%	20.5%	37.5%	21.1%	19.8%	16.9%
OFTEN	6.8%	5.9%	6.3%	5.4%	10.4%	3.3%	5.8%	9.7%
VERY OFTEN	3.0%	.7%	1.9%	1.6%	4.2%	1.1%	.0%	4.5%
Q34_9.WRITE LETTER TO NEWSPAPER								
NOT AT ALL	59.1%	64.9%	65.8%	61.3%	52.1%	63.7%	63.1%	57.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	30.6%	27.9%	23.6%	33.9%	31.3%	28.6%	29.5%	30.5%
OFTEN	7.7%	5.2%	6.2%	3.8%	16.7%	2.2%	5.7%	10.4%
VERY OFTEN	2.6%	1.9%	4.3%	1.1%	.0%	5.5%	1.6%	1.3%
Q34_10.ATTEND COUNCIL MTGS								
NOT AT ALL	64.3%	68.2%	68.3%	67.2%	52.1%	61.5%	68.0%	64.9%
NOT VERY OFTEN	28.9%	25.3%	26.1%	28.0%	31.3%	28.6%	28.7%	27.3%
OFTEN	5.5%	4.5%	3.1%	4.3%	14.6%	6.6%	3.3%	5.8%
VERY OFTEN	1.3%	1.9%	2.5%	.5%	2.1%	3.3%	.0%	1.9%
Q34_11.SIGN PETITION								
NOT AT ALL	15.3%	23.4%	19.3%	16.1%	22.9%	22.0%	22.1%	11.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	24.3%	23.4%	16.8%	32.3%	18.8%	19.8%	27.9%	22.1%
OFTEN	41.3%	34.4%	43.5%	32.8%	39.6%	36.3%	40.2%	39.6%
VERY OFTEN	19.1%	18.8%	20.5%	18.8%	18.8%	22.0%	9.8%	26.6%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q13.APPROVE NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS									
DISAPPR STR	9.7%	6.1%	14.4%	12.1%	9.3%	8.8%	11.3%	7.5%	12.0%
DISAPPR	12.4%	14.9%	10.8%	14.1%	11.5%	11.8%	15.0%	11.2%	11.3%
NEUTRAL	7.6%	8.8%	6.5%	10.7%	7.7%	1.5%	9.8%	6.0%	7.5%
APPROVE	33.1%	26.3%	32.4%	33.6%	30.6%	25.0%	30.8%	30.6%	30.8%
APPROVE STR	37.2%	43.9%	36.0%	29.5%	41.0%	52.9%	33.1%	44.8%	38.3%
Q17.APPROVAL OF NORTH PARK PROGRAM									
DISAPPR STR	8.3%	7.0%	12.2%	9.4%	6.0%	17.6%	6.8%	7.5%	13.5%
DISAPPR	11.7%	8.8%	6.5%	10.1%	7.1%	11.8%	9.0%	7.5%	10.5%
NEUTRAL	26.2%	25.4%	18.7%	31.5%	24.0%	4.4%	30.1%	16.4%	24.1%
APPROVE	35.2%	33.3%	41.7%	32.9%	42.6%	30.9%	39.1%	40.3%	31.6%
APPROVE STR	18.6%	25.4%	20.9%	16.1%	20.2%	35.3%	15.0%	28.4%	20.3%
Q16.EXTENT PILOT PROGRAM AFFECTS ME									
NOT AT ALL	66.4%	60.7%	52.2%	66.9%	59.0%	47.1%	62.6%	60.2%	56.6%
NOT MUCH	14.0%	17.9%	14.0%	12.7%	15.3%	20.6%	16.8%	14.3%	14.7%
SOME	11.9%	15.2%	22.8%	13.4%	17.5%	20.6%	15.3%	16.5%	17.8%
A GREAT DEAL	7.7%	6.3%	11.0%	7.0%	8.2%	11.8%	5.3%	9.0%	10.9%
Q24.PROGRAM EFFECT ON OWN LIFE									
VERY NEG	.7%	4.4%	5.8%	2.7%	3.3%	5.9%	2.3%	3.0%	5.3%
SOMEWT NEG	4.1%	6.1%	6.5%	5.4%	3.8%	10.3%	4.5%	3.7%	8.3%
NEUTRAL	85.5%	78.9%	75.5%	85.2%	78.7%	72.1%	85.0%	79.1%	75.9%
SOMEWHT POS	8.3%	7.0%	9.4%	4.7%	10.9%	10.3%	6.8%	10.4%	8.3%
VERY POS	1.4%	3.5%	2.9%	2.0%	3.3%	1.5%	1.5%	3.7%	2.3%
Q25.PROGRAM EFFECT ON COMMUNITY									
VERY NEG	3.4%	6.1%	7.9%	4.7%	3.8%	13.2%	4.5%	3.0%	9.8%
SOMEWT NEG	15.2%	7.0%	10.8%	8.7%	7.7%	26.5%	12.0%	12.7%	9.0%
NEUTRAL	52.4%	50.0%	38.1%	62.4%	42.6%	23.5%	57.1%	32.8%	50.4%
SOMEWHT POS	22.1%	28.9%	31.7%	17.4%	35.0%	29.4%	21.8%	39.6%	21.1%
VERY POS	6.9%	7.9%	11.5%	6.7%	10.9%	7.4%	4.5%	11.9%	9.8%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q26.EFFECT OF PROGRAM ON NORTH PARK IMAGE									
VERY NEG	3.4%	5.3%	12.2%	6.0%	4.9%	14.7%	6.0%	4.5%	10.5%
SOMEWT NEG	22.1%	21.1%	15.8%	19.5%	15.8%	29.4%	16.5%	18.7%	23.3%
NEUTRAL	55.2%	51.8%	36.0%	51.0%	48.6%	36.8%	56.4%	46.3%	39.8%
SOMEWHT POS	16.6%	17.5%	25.2%	18.8%	23.5%	13.2%	18.0%	25.4%	16.5%
VERY POS	2.8%	4.4%	10.8%	4.7%	7.1%	5.9%	3.0%	5.2%	9.8%
Q2.INTEREST IN NORTH PARK POLITICAL/SOCIAL									
NOT INTERESTED	10.5%	6.1%	2.9%	8.1%	7.2%	1.5%	7.6%	6.7%	5.3%
NOT VERY INTER	29.4%	14.0%	15.1%	22.1%	21.5%	11.8%	29.8%	19.4%	11.3%
INTERESTED	49.0%	55.3%	44.6%	54.4%	48.6%	39.7%	53.4%	50.0%	44.4%
VERY INTERESTED	11.2%	24.6%	37.4%	15.4%	22.7%	47.1%	9.2%	23.9%	39.1%
Q6.POLITICIANS DO WHAT IS IN BEST INTEREST									
STRONGLY DISAG	28.6%	20.5%	22.2%	25.2%	20.5%	30.3%	24.6%	22.1%	25.0%
SMWT DISAGREE	33.6%	32.1%	23.7%	33.3%	31.3%	19.7%	34.6%	32.1%	23.4%
SMWT AGREE	34.3%	41.1%	41.5%	33.3%	41.5%	42.4%	34.6%	41.2%	39.8%
STRONGLY AGREE	3.6%	6.3%	12.6%	8.2%	6.8%	7.6%	6.2%	4.6%	11.7%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK									
NOTHING AT ALL	41.4%	21.1%	18.7%	42.3%	24.6%	2.9%	39.1%	25.4%	18.0%
NOT MUCH	17.9%	21.9%	25.9%	23.5%	25.7%	8.8%	25.6%	20.1%	20.3%
SOME	27.6%	42.1%	30.2%	26.8%	35.0%	39.7%	30.1%	38.1%	30.1%
A GREAT DEAL	13.1%	14.9%	25.2%	7.4%	14.8%	48.5%	5.3%	16.4%	31.6%
Q7.AMOUNT HEARD INJECTION DRUG USE IN NORTH PARK									
NOTHING AT ALL	41.4%	21.1%	18.7%	42.3%	24.6%	2.9%	39.1%	25.4%	18.0%
NOT MUCH	17.9%	21.9%	25.9%	23.5%	25.7%	8.8%	25.6%	20.1%	20.3%
SOME	27.6%	42.1%	30.2%	26.8%	35.0%	39.7%	30.1%	38.1%	30.1%
A GREAT DEAL	13.1%	14.9%	25.2%	7.4%	14.8%	48.5%	5.3%	16.4%	31.6%
Q9.IV USERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD AFFECT Y									
NOT AT ALL	42.1%	33.0%	25.7%	38.1%	30.6%	33.8%	37.9%	28.2%	35.6%
NOT MUCH	17.9%	25.0%	26.5%	21.1%	21.7%	29.4%	17.4%	29.8%	21.2%
SOME	27.6%	29.5%	25.7%	27.9%	26.7%	27.9%	28.8%	26.0%	27.3%
A GREAT DEAL	12.4%	12.5%	22.1%	12.9%	21.1%	8.8%	15.9%	16.0%	15.9%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	COMMUNITY INFORMATION								
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q10. ISSUE OF PRESENCE OF ID USERS									
NOT AN ISSUE	14.1%	7.3%	7.4%	16.1%	6.2%	7.5%	8.1%	10.7%	10.9%
NOT VERY IMPRTNT	21.5%	23.9%	15.4%	19.0%	18.5%	25.4%	22.8%	19.8%	17.2%
IMPORTANT	43.7%	47.7%	42.6%	36.5%	50.0%	44.8%	48.0%	42.0%	43.0%
VERY IMPORTANT	20.7%	21.1%	34.6%	28.5%	25.3%	22.4%	21.1%	27.5%	28.9%
Q11. CAN INFLUENCE INJECTION DRUG USE									
NOT AT ALL	40.6%	32.7%	24.8%	40.5%	30.4%	22.7%	38.2%	27.1%	33.6%
NOT MUCH	25.9%	25.7%	27.7%	23.6%	28.7%	25.8%	29.0%	29.3%	20.6%
SOME	29.4%	31.9%	39.4%	29.1%	31.5%	50.0%	27.5%	36.1%	37.4%
A GREAT DEAL	4.2%	9.7%	8.0%	6.8%	9.4%	1.5%	5.3%	7.5%	8.4%
Q15. AMOUNT HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM IN NORTH PARK									
NOTHING AT ALL	63.4%	50.0%	45.3%	73.2%	56.8%	.0%	72.2%	49.3%	38.3%
NOT MUCH	9.7%	10.5%	18.0%	10.7%	15.3%	11.8%	11.3%	11.2%	16.5%
SOME	17.2%	29.8%	25.2%	14.1%	24.0%	42.6%	12.0%	30.6%	27.8%
A GREAT DEAL	9.7%	9.6%	11.5%	2.0%	3.8%	45.6%	4.5%	9.0%	17.3%
Q18. FAVOR/OPOSE PROGRAM BEING PERMANENT									
STR OPOSE	15.2%	12.3%	16.5%	16.8%	10.4%	22.1%	12.8%	12.7%	18.8%
OPOSE	6.2%	7.0%	3.6%	6.7%	4.9%	4.4%	5.3%	6.0%	5.3%
NEUTRAL	26.9%	21.1%	16.5%	29.5%	19.1%	10.3%	29.3%	15.7%	19.5%
FAVOR	22.1%	29.8%	23.0%	22.1%	26.2%	25.0%	27.8%	24.6%	21.1%
STR FAVOR	29.7%	29.8%	40.3%	24.8%	39.3%	38.2%	24.8%	41.0%	35.3%
Q19. ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PERMANENT PROGRAM									
NOT AT ALL	33.6%	25.2%	14.0%	32.9%	19.7%	17.6%	30.5%	20.3%	22.1%
NOT MUCH	28.0%	29.7%	23.5%	29.5%	25.3%	26.5%	27.3%	26.3%	27.5%
SOME	35.0%	38.7%	44.9%	30.1%	46.1%	42.6%	35.2%	45.9%	37.4%
A GREAT DEAL	3.5%	6.3%	17.6%	7.5%	9.0%	13.2%	7.0%	7.5%	13.0%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	COMMUNITY INFORMATION								
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q20. VIEW OF PROGRAM CHANGED SINCE FEB 2003									
YES	7.8%	7.3%	27.1%	2.8%	17.6%	19.7%	12.1%	10.9%	20.3%
NO	92.2%	92.7%	72.9%	97.2%	82.4%	80.3%	87.9%	89.1%	79.7%
Q20A. CURRENT VIEW OF PROGRAM									
MORE POSITIVE	25.0%	25.0%	57.9%	.0%	53.8%	46.2%	25.0%	71.4%	43.8%
MORE NEGATIVE	75.0%	50.0%	36.8%	100.0%	38.5%	46.2%	75.0%	28.6%	43.8%
MORE NEUTRAL	.0%	25.0%	5.3%	.0%	7.7%	7.7%	.0%	.0%	12.5%
Q21A. KNOW PROGRAM MAIN LOCATION									
NO	90.3%	86.8%	88.5%	100.0%	96.7%	42.6%	96.2%	88.1%	82.0%
CORRECT	9.7%	13.2%	11.5%	.0%	3.3%	57.4%	3.8%	11.9%	18.0%
Q21B. KNOW USE MOBILE VAN									
NO	88.3%	84.2%	85.6%	100.0%	96.7%	27.9%	94.0%	84.3%	80.5%
MOBILE VAN	11.7%	15.8%	14.4%	.0%	3.3%	72.1%	6.0%	15.7%	19.5%
Q21C. KNOW OTHER SERVICES									
NO	91.0%	90.4%	88.5%	100.0%	97.3%	48.5%	97.7%	88.8%	83.5%
YES	9.0%	9.6%	11.5%	.0%	2.7%	51.5%	2.3%	11.2%	16.5%
Q21E. PROGRAM IS ONE PLACE TO DISPOSE NEEDLES									
NO	51.0%	39.5%	39.6%	100.0%	9.3%	13.2%	51.9%	38.8%	40.6%
TRUE	49.0%	60.5%	60.4%	.0%	90.7%	86.8%	48.1%	61.2%	59.4%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q22. PERSONALLY INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN									
PLANNING	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	.8%	.0%
IMPLEMENTATION	.0%	.0%	.7%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%
NO/NEITHER	99.3%	100.0%	99.3%	100.0%	99.5%	98.5%	100.0%	98.5%	100.0%
Q22A. WHY NOT INVOLVED PLANNING/IMPLEMENTIN									
DIDN'T KNOW	64.5%	64.2%	51.5%	65.7%	61.8%	43.1%	66.1%	58.1%	56.2%
DIDN'T CARE	12.8%	7.3%	13.4%	11.9%	11.2%	10.8%	11.0%	14.0%	9.2%
WOULDN'T MATTER	1.4%	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%	1.1%	3.1%	2.4%	.8%	1.5%
TOO BUSY/NO TIME	9.2%	11.9%	10.4%	7.7%	10.1%	16.9%	7.9%	10.9%	12.3%
OTHER	12.1%	14.7%	23.1%	13.3%	15.7%	26.2%	12.6%	16.3%	20.8%
Q23. SPOKE ABOUT PROGRAM TO OTHERS INVOLVED									
PLANNING	.7%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.5%	3.0%	.0%	.8%	1.5%
IMPLEMENTATION	.0%	.9%	2.2%	1.4%	.5%	1.5%	.0%	.8%	2.3%
BOTH	1.4%	1.8%	5.8%	.0%	2.7%	10.4%	.8%	4.5%	3.8%
NO/NEITHER	97.9%	97.4%	90.6%	98.6%	96.2%	85.1%	99.2%	94.0%	92.4%
Q29. SPECIAL INTERESTS HAVE TOO MUCH INFLUENC									
DISAGREE STR	10.3%	7.0%	14.4%	10.1%	9.3%	16.2%	5.3%	6.7%	20.3%
DISAGREE	17.9%	11.4%	26.6%	20.1%	20.2%	14.7%	19.5%	22.4%	15.8%
NEUTRAL	60.7%	70.2%	44.6%	59.7%	60.1%	47.1%	63.9%	59.7%	49.6%
AGREE	7.6%	7.0%	10.8%	6.7%	7.7%	14.7%	9.8%	9.0%	6.8%
AGREE STR	3.4%	4.4%	3.6%	3.4%	2.7%	7.4%	1.5%	2.2%	7.5%
Q30. CAN TRUST OFFICIALS RUNNING PROGRAM									
DISAGREE STR	8.3%	3.5%	11.5%	10.1%	6.6%	7.4%	7.5%	6.7%	9.8%
DISAGREE	12.4%	16.7%	9.4%	11.4%	12.6%	14.7%	12.0%	9.7%	15.8%
NEUTRAL	26.2%	21.9%	21.6%	36.2%	16.9%	13.2%	32.3%	19.4%	18.8%
AGREE	41.4%	46.5%	43.9%	34.9%	51.9%	41.2%	40.6%	47.8%	42.9%
AGREE STR	11.7%	11.4%	13.7%	7.4%	12.0%	23.5%	7.5%	16.4%	12.8%
Q31. ATTENDED COMMUNITY MEETINGS ON PROGRAM									
YES	2.8%	2.6%	4.4%	.0%	2.2%	13.2%	1.5%	2.2%	6.1%
NO	97.2%	97.4%	95.6%	100.0%	97.8%	86.8%	98.5%	97.8%	93.9%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q31A.MEETINGS PROVIDED MEANINGFUL DISCUSS OF									
YES	75.0%	100.0%	83.3%	.0%	100.0%	77.8%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%
NO	25.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	25.0%
Q32.PUBLIC WAS ASKED ABOUT VIEWS OF PROGRAM									
YES	17.5%	25.0%	26.7%	3.8%	24.8%	55.6%	15.2%	23.4%	29.9%
NO	82.5%	75.0%	73.3%	96.2%	75.2%	44.4%	84.8%	76.6%	70.1%
EDUCATION									
0-12	22.8%	22.1%	23.0%	25.0%	26.8%	7.4%	33.8%	19.4%	15.2%
13-16	32.4%	35.4%	30.2%	31.1%	35.0%	27.9%	34.6%	28.4%	34.1%
17+	44.8%	42.5%	46.8%	43.9%	38.3%	64.7%	31.6%	52.2%	50.8%
LATINO									
NO	86.9%	82.5%	68.3%	79.2%	74.9%	89.7%	72.9%	79.9%	84.2%
LATINO	13.1%	17.5%	31.7%	20.8%	25.1%	10.3%	27.1%	20.1%	15.8%
RACE									
CAUCASIAN	70.5%	63.6%	51.5%	60.6%	60.5%	67.7%	55.8%	64.6%	64.8%
AFR-AMER	5.8%	4.5%	8.2%	7.0%	5.6%	6.2%	5.4%	4.7%	8.6%
HISPANIC	13.7%	18.2%	32.8%	21.8%	26.0%	10.8%	27.9%	21.3%	16.4%
ASIAN	2.2%	1.8%	1.5%	2.1%	1.1%	3.1%	3.1%	1.6%	.8%
OTHER	7.9%	11.8%	6.0%	8.5%	6.8%	12.3%	7.8%	7.9%	9.4%
PARTY									
REPUBLICAN	13.9%	17.1%	15.5%	26.3%	9.8%	8.9%	14.1%	9.0%	22.5%
INDEP	39.6%	24.4%	25.2%	25.3%	36.4%	25.0%	40.0%	31.0%	21.6%
DEMOCRAT	46.5%	58.5%	59.2%	48.5%	53.8%	66.1%	45.9%	60.0%	55.9%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
IDEOLOGY									
CONSERVATIVE	16.3%	13.4%	22.2%	22.8%	15.2%	11.9%	18.6%	12.1%	21.7%
MID ROAD	45.4%	39.3%	36.3%	42.1%	43.3%	31.3%	45.7%	40.9%	35.7%
LIBERAL	38.3%	47.3%	41.5%	35.2%	41.6%	56.7%	35.7%	47.0%	42.6%
Q45.RELIGIOUS FAITH									
PROTESTANT	22.2%	23.2%	19.1%	22.8%	22.1%	16.2%	17.4%	18.9%	27.7%
CATHOLIC	24.3%	28.6%	33.8%	29.0%	32.6%	17.6%	31.1%	26.5%	28.5%
JEWISH	.7%	1.8%	3.7%	.7%	1.1%	7.4%	1.5%	.8%	3.8%
MUSLIM	.7%	.0%	.7%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.8%	.0%
BUDDHIST	4.9%	2.7%	.7%	2.8%	1.7%	5.9%	3.0%	4.5%	.8%
OTHER	19.4%	21.4%	17.6%	18.6%	23.2%	13.2%	23.5%	16.7%	19.2%
NONE	27.8%	22.3%	24.3%	24.8%	19.3%	39.7%	22.7%	31.8%	20.0%
Q46.FREQUENCY ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES									
ONCE A WEEK	24.5%	24.3%	21.2%	26.9%	23.3%	16.2%	30.0%	12.8%	27.7%
ONCE A MONTH	7.0%	7.2%	13.9%	9.7%	11.1%	5.9%	8.5%	10.5%	10.0%
SEVERAL TIMES/YR	23.8%	19.8%	25.5%	22.1%	23.3%	25.0%	20.0%	25.6%	23.8%
ONCE A YEAR/LESS	8.4%	12.6%	8.8%	12.4%	7.8%	8.8%	10.0%	10.5%	8.5%
NOT AT ALL	36.4%	36.0%	30.7%	29.0%	34.4%	44.1%	31.5%	40.6%	30.0%
Q49.EVER USED SYRINGES OR IV NEEDLES									
YES	15.2%	18.4%	14.5%	12.8%	17.6%	17.6%	15.8%	17.2%	14.4%
NO	84.8%	81.6%	85.5%	87.2%	82.4%	82.4%	84.2%	82.8%	85.6%
GENDER									
MALE	52.4%	52.6%	45.3%	54.4%	47.0%	48.5%	50.4%	50.0%	49.6%
FEMALE	47.6%	47.4%	54.7%	45.6%	53.0%	51.5%	49.6%	50.0%	50.4%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q14 1.PROGRAMS: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE									
DISAGREE STR	8.3%	11.4%	13.7%	10.1%	10.9%	13.2%	8.3%	11.2%	13.5%
DISAGREE	40.0%	39.5%	37.4%	30.9%	44.3%	42.6%	36.8%	45.5%	34.6%
NEUTRAL	13.8%	7.9%	7.2%	11.4%	10.4%	4.4%	13.5%	8.2%	7.5%
AGREE	25.5%	33.3%	24.5%	30.9%	23.5%	29.4%	28.6%	27.6%	25.6%
AGREE STR	12.4%	7.9%	17.3%	16.8%	10.9%	10.3%	12.8%	7.5%	18.8%
Q14 2.ATTRACT DRUG DEALERS									
DISAGREE STR	8.3%	14.0%	11.5%	11.4%	9.8%	13.2%	9.8%	14.2%	9.0%
DISAGREE	40.0%	33.3%	33.1%	26.2%	41.5%	39.7%	37.6%	36.6%	32.3%
NEUTRAL	13.8%	11.4%	7.2%	15.4%	7.1%	10.3%	9.8%	9.0%	13.5%
AGREE	26.2%	30.7%	27.3%	28.9%	28.4%	26.5%	31.6%	23.9%	29.3%
AGREE STR	11.7%	10.5%	20.9%	18.1%	13.1%	10.3%	11.3%	16.4%	15.8%
Q14 3.LOWER PROPERTY VALUES									
DISAGREE STR	7.6%	14.9%	10.8%	9.4%	11.5%	13.2%	6.8%	11.9%	14.3%
DISAGREE	34.5%	30.7%	35.3%	28.2%	36.6%	36.8%	34.6%	36.6%	29.3%
NEUTRAL	13.8%	11.4%	10.8%	11.4%	13.1%	10.3%	14.3%	9.0%	12.8%
AGREE	33.1%	33.3%	26.6%	36.9%	27.3%	27.9%	34.6%	30.6%	27.8%
AGREE STR	11.0%	9.6%	16.5%	14.1%	11.5%	11.8%	9.8%	11.9%	15.8%
Q14 4.REDUCE PUBLIC COSTS OF HIV/AIDS									
DISAGREE STR	23.4%	32.5%	29.5%	26.2%	27.3%	35.3%	21.1%	34.3%	29.3%
DISAGREE	48.3%	36.0%	42.4%	37.6%	47.0%	42.6%	42.9%	43.3%	42.1%
NEUTRAL	11.0%	7.9%	5.0%	9.4%	7.1%	7.4%	11.3%	6.0%	6.8%
AGREE	11.7%	15.8%	17.3%	19.5%	13.1%	8.8%	17.3%	13.4%	13.5%
AGREE STR	5.5%	7.9%	5.8%	7.4%	5.5%	5.9%	7.5%	3.0%	8.3%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q14 5.REDUCE COMMUNICABLE DISEASE									
DISAGREE STR	26.9%	36.8%	33.1%	24.8%	33.9%	44.1%	25.6%	41.0%	30.1%
DISAGREE	57.2%	39.5%	38.1%	49.7%	44.8%	36.8%	54.1%	42.5%	39.1%
NEUTRAL	4.1%	6.1%	2.9%	4.0%	3.8%	5.9%	3.0%	3.0%	6.8%
AGREE	7.6%	13.2%	16.5%	12.8%	13.7%	7.4%	10.5%	11.9%	14.3%
AGREE STR	4.1%	4.4%	9.4%	8.7%	3.8%	5.9%	6.8%	1.5%	9.8%
Q14 6.DECREASE CRIME									
DISAGREE STR	6.9%	8.8%	5.8%	7.4%	5.5%	10.3%	3.8%	10.4%	6.8%
DISAGREE	26.2%	17.5%	26.6%	20.1%	28.4%	19.1%	18.8%	29.1%	23.3%
NEUTRAL	14.5%	14.9%	13.7%	16.8%	12.6%	14.7%	14.3%	12.7%	16.5%
AGREE	39.3%	46.5%	38.8%	38.9%	42.1%	44.1%	51.1%	37.3%	35.3%
AGREE STR	13.1%	12.3%	15.1%	16.8%	11.5%	11.8%	12.0%	10.4%	18.0%
Q14 7.INCREASE COMMUNITY CONFLICT									
DISAGREE STR	4.1%	8.8%	5.8%	6.0%	7.1%	4.4%	6.0%	6.7%	6.0%
DISAGREE	26.9%	25.4%	33.1%	26.2%	31.1%	26.5%	28.6%	26.1%	30.8%
NEUTRAL	7.6%	7.0%	6.5%	8.1%	6.0%	7.4%	4.5%	9.0%	7.5%
AGREE	42.1%	46.5%	34.5%	42.3%	37.7%	44.1%	45.1%	38.8%	37.6%
AGREE STR	19.3%	12.3%	20.1%	17.4%	18.0%	17.6%	15.8%	19.4%	18.0%
Q14 8.ATTRACT HOMELESS									
DISAGREE STR	5.5%	14.0%	6.5%	8.7%	7.7%	8.8%	4.5%	10.4%	9.8%
DISAGREE	38.6%	29.8%	36.0%	30.2%	36.6%	42.6%	33.1%	36.6%	36.1%
NEUTRAL	9.0%	9.6%	4.3%	10.7%	4.9%	7.4%	8.3%	5.2%	9.0%
AGREE	31.0%	36.8%	34.5%	34.2%	37.7%	23.5%	45.9%	29.1%	27.1%
AGREE STR	15.9%	9.6%	18.7%	16.1%	13.1%	17.6%	8.3%	18.7%	18.0%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A_1.HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM: COMMUNITY MEETINGS									
NOT AT ALL	81.1%	76.8%	47.4%	79.5%	67.1%	55.9%	78.4%	73.5%	53.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	11.3%	16.1%	31.6%	12.8%	21.5%	26.5%	21.6%	14.7%	27.2%
OFTEN	5.7%	7.1%	14.5%	7.7%	10.1%	10.3%	.0%	7.4%	16.0%
VERY OFTEN	1.9%	.0%	6.6%	.0%	1.3%	7.4%	.0%	4.4%	3.7%
Q15A_2.NEWSPAPERS									
NOT AT ALL	35.8%	32.1%	23.7%	40.0%	32.1%	22.1%	51.4%	27.9%	22.2%
NOT VERY OFTEN	32.1%	39.3%	35.5%	37.5%	33.3%	36.8%	40.5%	35.3%	33.3%
OFTEN	20.8%	12.5%	31.6%	20.0%	20.5%	26.5%	5.4%	25.0%	28.4%
VERY OFTEN	11.3%	16.1%	9.2%	2.5%	14.1%	14.7%	2.7%	11.8%	16.0%
Q15A_3.COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER									
NOT AT ALL	46.2%	45.6%	21.1%	57.5%	35.9%	22.1%	44.4%	36.8%	30.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	21.2%	26.3%	36.8%	32.5%	30.8%	26.5%	33.3%	26.5%	30.5%
OFTEN	32.7%	17.5%	28.9%	5.0%	25.6%	39.7%	16.7%	32.4%	25.6%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	10.5%	13.2%	5.0%	7.7%	11.8%	5.6%	4.4%	13.4%
Q15A_4.POSTERS									
NOT AT ALL	81.1%	80.4%	59.2%	77.5%	70.5%	69.1%	81.1%	69.1%	69.1%
NOT VERY OFTEN	7.5%	16.1%	32.9%	17.5%	23.1%	20.6%	10.8%	20.6%	25.9%
OFTEN	11.3%	3.6%	6.6%	5.0%	5.1%	10.3%	8.1%	10.3%	3.7%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%
Q15A_5.RADIO									
NOT AT ALL	75.5%	73.7%	49.3%	76.9%	63.3%	58.8%	73.0%	69.1%	56.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	20.8%	21.1%	29.3%	17.9%	25.3%	26.5%	21.6%	22.1%	27.2%
OFTEN	3.8%	3.5%	20.0%	.0%	11.4%	14.7%	5.4%	7.4%	14.8%
VERY OFTEN	.0%	1.8%	1.3%	5.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	1.2%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q15A_6.TV									
NOT AT ALL	54.7%	42.9%	42.7%	64.1%	38.5%	44.1%	48.6%	47.1%	43.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	30.2%	44.6%	38.7%	25.6%	42.3%	41.2%	43.2%	36.8%	37.5%
OFTEN	13.2%	8.9%	14.7%	2.6%	17.9%	11.8%	8.1%	10.3%	16.3%
VERY OFTEN	1.9%	3.6%	4.0%	7.7%	1.3%	2.9%	.0%	5.9%	2.5%
Q15A_7.FAMILY MEMBERS									
NOT AT ALL	84.9%	92.9%	52.0%	80.0%	76.6%	67.2%	80.6%	73.5%	71.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	9.4%	1.8%	30.7%	12.5%	14.3%	19.4%	8.3%	19.1%	16.3%
OFTEN	3.8%	3.6%	6.7%	.0%	5.2%	7.5%	5.6%	5.9%	3.8%
VERY OFTEN	1.9%	1.8%	10.7%	7.5%	3.9%	6.0%	5.6%	1.5%	8.8%
Q15A_8.FRIENDS/NEIGHBORS									
NOT AT ALL	71.7%	40.4%	23.7%	50.0%	46.8%	32.4%	67.6%	44.1%	29.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	9.4%	26.3%	34.2%	30.0%	24.1%	23.5%	16.2%	26.5%	28.0%
OFTEN	17.0%	28.1%	21.1%	15.0%	20.3%	27.9%	13.5%	22.1%	25.6%
VERY OFTEN	1.9%	5.3%	21.1%	5.0%	8.9%	16.2%	2.7%	7.4%	17.1%
Q15A_9.PEOPLE AT WORK/SCHOOL									
NOT AT ALL	84.9%	71.4%	52.6%	82.1%	67.1%	58.8%	81.1%	69.1%	59.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	3.8%	10.7%	27.6%	7.7%	15.2%	20.6%	8.1%	14.7%	19.8%
OFTEN	3.8%	12.5%	15.8%	7.7%	13.9%	11.8%	10.8%	11.8%	12.3%
VERY OFTEN	7.5%	5.4%	3.9%	2.6%	3.8%	8.8%	.0%	4.4%	8.6%
Q15A_10.POLITICIANS/ PUBLIC									
NOT AT ALL	50.9%	43.9%	33.3%	59.0%	46.8%	26.5%	54.1%	50.7%	29.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	41.5%	33.3%	37.3%	33.3%	38.0%	38.2%	40.5%	31.3%	40.2%
OFTEN	5.7%	15.8%	18.7%	2.6%	11.4%	23.5%	2.7%	10.4%	22.0%
VERY OFTEN	1.9%	7.0%	10.7%	5.1%	3.8%	11.8%	2.7%	7.5%	8.5%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	COMMUNITY INFORMATION								
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27_1.CONSEQUENCES: INCREASE NUMBER NEEDLES									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	16.6%	18.4%	19.4%	14.1%	16.9%	29.4%	10.5%	25.4%	18.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	43.4%	45.6%	33.8%	32.9%	45.4%	44.1%	42.9%	41.0%	37.6%
DK	9.7%	3.5%	5.0%	9.4%	3.8%	5.9%	8.3%	2.2%	8.3%
LIKELY	15.9%	14.0%	18.0%	18.8%	17.5%	7.4%	21.1%	14.9%	12.8%
VERY LIKELY	14.5%	18.4%	23.7%	24.8%	16.4%	13.2%	17.3%	16.4%	23.3%
Q27_2.DECREASE INJECTION DRUG USE									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	21.4%	17.5%	15.8%	21.5%	16.4%	16.2%	23.3%	14.2%	17.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	40.0%	38.6%	36.0%	34.9%	42.1%	36.8%	37.6%	38.8%	39.1%
DK	8.3%	6.1%	3.6%	7.4%	4.4%	7.4%	6.0%	2.2%	9.8%
LIKELY	21.4%	26.3%	29.5%	22.8%	26.8%	27.9%	25.6%	31.3%	19.5%
VERY LIKELY	9.0%	11.4%	15.1%	13.4%	10.4%	11.8%	7.5%	13.4%	14.3%
Q27_3.THREATEN SAFETY OF CHILDREN									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	18.6%	14.0%	20.1%	14.8%	20.8%	16.2%	15.8%	20.1%	17.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	40.7%	35.1%	36.0%	31.5%	37.7%	48.5%	33.1%	42.5%	36.1%
DK	9.0%	11.4%	4.3%	10.1%	6.0%	8.8%	11.3%	4.5%	8.3%
LIKELY	18.6%	22.8%	18.7%	23.5%	20.8%	11.8%	21.8%	17.2%	21.8%
VERY LIKELY	13.1%	16.7%	20.9%	20.1%	14.8%	14.7%	18.0%	15.7%	16.5%
Q27_4.ATTRACT CRIME									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	12.4%	10.5%	8.6%	16.1%	7.7%	7.4%	8.3%	14.2%	9.8%
NOT VERY LIKELY	40.7%	40.4%	43.9%	31.5%	47.5%	48.5%	39.1%	42.5%	43.6%
DK	9.0%	9.6%	7.9%	11.4%	8.2%	4.4%	11.3%	8.2%	6.8%
LIKELY	22.8%	31.6%	20.1%	21.5%	24.6%	29.4%	26.3%	23.9%	22.6%
VERY LIKELY	15.2%	7.9%	19.4%	19.5%	12.0%	10.3%	15.0%	11.2%	17.3%
Q27_5.BRING COMMUNITY TOGETHER									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	7.6%	7.0%	9.4%	12.1%	4.4%	8.8%	7.5%	7.5%	9.0%
NOT VERY LIKELY	35.2%	31.6%	22.3%	28.2%	25.7%	42.6%	28.6%	29.9%	30.1%
DK	6.2%	6.1%	6.5%	9.4%	3.8%	5.9%	8.3%	3.0%	7.5%
LIKELY	35.9%	41.2%	37.4%	33.6%	42.6%	35.3%	39.8%	43.3%	30.8%
VERY LIKELY	15.2%	14.0%	24.5%	16.8%	23.5%	7.4%	15.8%	16.4%	22.6%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q27_6.LEAD USERS TO SEEK ADDICTION HELP									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	10.3%	5.3%	7.9%	12.8%	6.0%	2.9%	10.5%	5.2%	8.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	21.4%	23.7%	20.9%	21.5%	22.4%	22.1%	19.5%	25.4%	21.1%
DK	13.1%	7.9%	7.9%	11.4%	9.3%	8.8%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
LIKELY	37.9%	36.8%	36.0%	30.2%	38.3%	47.1%	40.6%	38.1%	31.6%
VERY LIKELY	17.2%	26.3%	27.3%	24.2%	24.0%	19.1%	18.8%	22.4%	28.6%
Q27_7.LEAD USERS TO SEEK HIV/AIDS HELP									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	6.9%	6.1%	5.8%	10.1%	3.8%	4.4%	7.5%	4.5%	6.8%
NOT VERY LIKELY	17.9%	16.7%	15.8%	18.1%	16.9%	16.2%	18.0%	16.4%	17.3%
DK	10.3%	14.9%	5.0%	10.7%	8.7%	10.3%	12.8%	4.5%	12.0%
LIKELY	36.6%	42.1%	43.9%	32.9%	43.2%	50.0%	35.3%	48.5%	37.6%
VERY LIKELY	28.3%	20.2%	29.5%	28.2%	27.3%	19.1%	26.3%	26.1%	26.3%
Q27_8.INCREASE ADDICTION IN AREA									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	24.8%	17.5%	18.0%	20.8%	15.8%	32.4%	15.8%	24.6%	21.1%
NOT VERY LIKELY	35.2%	46.5%	41.0%	31.5%	45.4%	47.1%	32.3%	45.5%	43.6%
DK	11.7%	9.6%	5.0%	10.7%	8.2%	5.9%	11.3%	5.2%	9.8%
LIKELY	14.5%	15.8%	18.7%	17.4%	18.0%	8.8%	21.1%	14.9%	12.8%
VERY LIKELY	13.8%	10.5%	17.3%	19.5%	12.6%	5.9%	19.5%	9.7%	12.8%
Q27_9.REDUCE SPREAD HIV/AIDS IN AREA									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	4.1%	5.3%	5.0%	5.4%	4.9%	2.9%	2.3%	1.5%	10.5%
NOT VERY LIKELY	15.2%	12.3%	12.9%	16.8%	12.0%	10.3%	16.5%	11.9%	12.0%
DK	5.5%	7.0%	2.9%	6.7%	2.7%	7.4%	5.3%	3.0%	6.8%
LIKELY	37.9%	33.3%	35.3%	36.9%	33.9%	36.8%	38.3%	35.1%	33.1%
VERY LIKELY	37.2%	42.1%	43.9%	34.2%	46.4%	42.6%	37.6%	48.5%	37.6%
Q27_10.REDUCE SPREAD HEP C IN AREA									
NOT AT ALL LKLY	4.1%	2.6%	5.8%	8.1%	2.2%	1.5%	5.3%	2.2%	5.3%
NOT VERY LIKELY	11.0%	14.0%	15.8%	15.4%	12.6%	11.8%	13.5%	7.5%	19.5%
DK	9.0%	3.5%	2.9%	7.4%	2.7%	7.4%	9.0%	1.5%	5.3%
LIKELY	36.6%	31.6%	28.1%	34.2%	32.2%	27.9%	29.3%	37.3%	30.1%
VERY LIKELY	39.3%	48.2%	47.5%	34.9%	50.3%	51.5%	42.9%	51.5%	39.8%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_1.PROGRAM: IN NORTH PARK BECAUSE USERS ARE THERE									
NO	74.5%	64.9%	59.0%	75.2%	63.9%	52.9%	69.2%	64.9%	64.7%
TRUE	25.5%	35.1%	41.0%	24.8%	36.1%	47.1%	30.8%	35.1%	35.3%
Q28_2.PARENTS AFRAID LET KIDS PLAY OUTSIDE									
NO	80.0%	76.3%	68.3%	75.8%	72.1%	79.4%	69.9%	76.9%	77.4%
TRUE	20.0%	23.7%	31.7%	24.2%	27.9%	20.6%	30.1%	23.1%	22.6%
Q28_3.OFFICIALS DON T LISTEN TO CITIZENS									
NO	81.4%	83.3%	74.8%	81.2%	79.8%	76.5%	79.7%	85.8%	73.7%
TRUE	18.6%	16.7%	25.2%	18.8%	20.2%	23.5%	20.3%	14.2%	26.3%
Q28_4.CITIZENS NOT INTERESTED PROVIDING INPUT									
NO	69.0%	64.0%	68.3%	75.2%	65.0%	57.4%	69.9%	64.2%	68.4%
TRUE	31.0%	36.0%	31.7%	24.8%	35.0%	42.6%	30.1%	35.8%	31.6%
Q28_5.REASON PEOPLE WON T LIVE IN NORTH PARK									
NO	93.8%	89.5%	87.1%	90.6%	91.3%	86.8%	91.0%	93.3%	86.5%
TRUE	6.2%	10.5%	12.9%	9.4%	8.7%	13.2%	9.0%	6.7%	13.5%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_6.DISTRIBUTED NEEDLES ARE MONITORED									
NO	68.3%	48.2%	54.0%	77.2%	48.6%	39.7%	69.9%	53.0%	50.4%
TRUE	31.7%	51.8%	46.0%	22.8%	51.4%	60.3%	30.1%	47.0%	49.6%
Q28_7.PROVIDED IMMEDIATE REFERRALS									
NO	75.2%	76.3%	68.3%	85.9%	67.8%	58.8%	79.7%	71.6%	67.7%
TRUE	24.8%	23.7%	31.7%	14.1%	32.2%	41.2%	20.3%	28.4%	32.3%
Q28_8.CITY NOTIFIED CITIZENS DURING PLANNING									
NO	86.2%	85.1%	83.5%	91.9%	80.3%	80.9%	86.5%	84.3%	83.5%
TRUE	13.8%	14.9%	16.5%	8.1%	19.7%	19.1%	13.5%	15.7%	16.5%
Q28_9.CITIZENS HAVE INFLUENCE OVER OPERATION									
NO	50.3%	36.8%	45.3%	57.0%	39.3%	32.4%	52.6%	39.6%	42.1%
TRUE	49.7%	63.2%	54.7%	43.0%	60.7%	67.6%	47.4%	60.4%	57.9%
Q28_10.RESIDENTS COULD PARTICIPATE IMPLEMENTATION									
NO	81.4%	64.0%	69.8%	86.6%	68.9%	51.5%	81.2%	68.7%	67.7%
TRUE	18.6%	36.0%	30.2%	13.4%	31.1%	48.5%	18.8%	31.3%	32.3%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q28_11.I HEARD ABOUT PUBLIC FORUM ON PROGRAM									
NO	90.3%	85.1%	77.0%	96.0%	83.6%	60.3%	91.7%	85.8%	75.2%
TRUE	9.7%	14.9%	23.0%	4.0%	16.4%	39.7%	8.3%	14.2%	24.8%
Q28_12.MOST CITIZENS KNOW LITTLE ABOUT PROGRAM									
NO	18.6%	19.3%	20.1%	20.1%	19.7%	17.6%	21.1%	18.7%	18.8%
TRUE	81.4%	80.7%	79.9%	79.9%	80.3%	82.4%	78.9%	81.3%	81.2%
Q28_13.BUSINESSES PAID SO WON'T OPPOSE									
NO	95.2%	95.6%	90.6%	94.6%	91.8%	97.1%	96.2%	97.8%	87.2%
TRUE	4.8%	4.4%	9.4%	5.4%	8.2%	2.9%	3.8%	2.2%	12.8%
Q28_14.CITY COUNCIL SHOWN RESPECT FOR CITIZENS									
NO	82.8%	70.2%	66.2%	89.3%	63.9%	64.7%	82.0%	70.9%	67.7%
TRUE	17.2%	29.8%	33.8%	10.7%	36.1%	35.3%	18.0%	29.1%	32.3%
Q28_15.WEALTHIER NEIGHBORHOODS DID NOT WANT									
NO	64.1%	61.4%	56.1%	62.4%	59.0%	61.8%	63.2%	61.2%	57.9%
TRUE	35.9%	38.6%	43.9%	37.6%	41.0%	38.2%	36.8%	38.8%	42.1%
Q28_16.POLICE RESPONSE ADEQUATE TO NP									
NO	79.3%	70.2%	63.3%	82.6%	65.0%	63.2%	77.4%	62.7%	73.7%
TRUE	20.7%	29.8%	36.7%	17.4%	35.0%	36.8%	22.6%	37.3%	26.3%

Use of Sources about Community Events, Information Level, Exposure to Media

	NUMBER SOURCES COMMUNITY INFORMATION			RELATIVE INFORMATION			EXPOSURE TO MEDIA		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
Q34_7.ROLE IN COUNCIL CAMPAIGN									
NOT AT ALL	74.5%	74.3%	58.0%	78.2%	65.6%	55.9%	79.7%	70.1%	55.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.9%	15.9%	28.3%	12.9%	25.1%	26.5%	12.0%	23.1%	27.5%
OFTEN	2.8%	6.2%	8.0%	4.1%	5.5%	10.3%	5.3%	2.2%	9.9%
VERY OFTEN	4.8%	3.5%	5.8%	4.8%	3.8%	7.4%	3.0%	4.5%	6.9%
Q34_8.GIVE MONEY COUNCIL CAMPAIGN									
NOT AT ALL	81.9%	77.0%	59.1%	76.7%	73.2%	61.2%	85.6%	73.9%	57.7%
NOT VERY OFTEN	13.9%	15.0%	28.5%	15.8%	20.2%	23.9%	10.6%	20.9%	26.2%
OFTEN	3.5%	6.2%	8.8%	6.8%	4.9%	9.0%	3.8%	4.5%	10.8%
VERY OFTEN	.7%	1.8%	3.6%	.7%	1.6%	6.0%	.0%	.7%	5.4%
Q34_9.WRITE LETTER TO NEWSPAPER									
NOT AT ALL	73.1%	59.3%	52.9%	69.4%	59.6%	52.9%	78.9%	61.2%	45.8%
NOT VERY OFTEN	17.9%	36.3%	34.8%	22.4%	30.6%	39.7%	17.3%	32.8%	37.4%
OFTEN	7.6%	4.4%	7.2%	6.8%	7.1%	4.4%	3.0%	4.5%	12.2%
VERY OFTEN	1.4%	.0%	5.1%	1.4%	2.7%	2.9%	.8%	1.5%	4.6%
Q34_10.ATTEND COUNCIL MTGS									
NOT AT ALL	75.9%	65.5%	55.8%	68.0%	68.9%	52.9%	79.7%	70.1%	47.3%
NOT VERY OFTEN	18.6%	28.3%	35.5%	29.3%	21.3%	39.7%	16.5%	26.1%	39.7%
OFTEN	4.8%	5.3%	5.8%	2.0%	7.7%	5.9%	3.0%	3.0%	9.9%
VERY OFTEN	.7%	.9%	2.9%	.7%	2.2%	1.5%	.8%	.7%	3.1%
Q34_11.SIGN PETITION									
NOT AT ALL	22.8%	12.4%	19.6%	24.5%	19.1%	4.4%	30.8%	13.4%	11.5%
NOT VERY OFTEN	25.5%	30.1%	17.4%	20.4%	27.3%	23.5%	22.6%	26.1%	23.7%
OFTEN	35.9%	40.7%	37.7%	34.7%	36.6%	47.1%	32.3%	40.3%	40.5%
VERY OFTEN	15.9%	16.8%	25.4%	20.4%	16.9%	25.0%	14.3%	20.1%	24.4%

Demographic Variables

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
Q35A.DAYS WATCH LOCAL NEWS ON TV										
Mean	4.00	4.47	5.26	4.53	4.67	4.17	4.41	4.78	4.45	4.58
Std Deviation	2.54	2.48	2.46	2.66	2.45	2.61	2.61	2.38	2.56	2.53
Q35B.READ LOCAL NEWSPAPER										
Mean	2.83	2.97	3.79	2.47	3.27	3.79	3.09	3.28	3.89	2.80
Std Deviation	2.53	2.65	3.05	2.61	2.74	2.78	2.70	2.89	2.82	2.66
Q35C.LISTEN LOCAL NEWS ON RADI										
Mean	3.49	3.90	3.60	2.90	3.62	4.47	3.53	4.04	4.18	3.40
Std Deviation	2.81	2.84	2.98	2.81	2.87	2.65	2.90	2.78	2.87	2.83
Q35D.TALK TO OTHERS RE: LOCAL										
Mean	3.51	3.87	3.50	2.93	3.94	3.85	3.54	3.85	4.04	3.45
Std Deviation	2.44	2.21	2.16	2.18	2.25	2.25	2.18	2.50	2.22	2.29
Q35E.TIMES PAST 6 MONTHS READ NP NEWSLETTER										
Mean	2.94	3.27	4.32	3.32	3.49	3.81	3.59	3.22	4.43	3.00
Std Deviation	6.46	4.45	5.76	7.12	5.69	3.91	6.41	3.60	5.49	5.76
Q35F.ATTEND NP MTGS										
Mean	.31	.36	.81	.13	.61	.61	.52	.35	.71	.37
Std Deviation	1.79	.98	3.33	.70	2.84	1.82	2.39	1.23	1.82	2.35
Q38.AGE										
Mean	27.30	42.09	60.78	41.79	41.83	44.15	42.84	41.98	48.77	39.28
Std Deviation	4.20	4.31	9.66	16.11	14.85	11.91	15.48	12.80	14.08	14.00
Q39.YEARS OF EDUCATION										
Mean	14.35	15.12	14.96	13.14	14.90	16.49	14.82	14.76	15.69	14.33
Std Deviation	2.94	3.05	3.29	3.23	2.65	2.78	2.76	3.73	2.84	3.12
Q1.YEARS LIVED IN NORTH PARK										
Mean	4.43	10.08	18.59	9.55	10.56	11.55	10.80	10.56	16.66	7.38
Std Deviation	5.47	8.42	17.18	11.47	12.46	12.76	12.62	12.11	16.25	8.09

Demographic Variables

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASI AN	AFR- AMER	HISPANI C	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
Q35A.DAYS WATCH LOCAL NEWS ON TV												
Mean	4.82	4.64	4.30	4.45	4.82	4.37	5.33	4.82	4.00	4.50	4.20	4.86
Std Deviation	2.52	2.51	2.57	2.61	2.28	2.63	2.58	2.28	1.83	2.68	2.64	2.41
Q35B.READ LOCAL NEWSPAPER												
Mean	2.13	3.09	3.78	3.39	2.42	3.35	3.79	2.42	3.00	3.34	3.36	3.01
Std Deviation	2.69	2.68	2.71	2.77	2.61	2.79	2.78	2.61	2.89	2.74	2.77	2.75
Q35C.LISTEN LOCAL NEWS ON RADIO												
Mean	2.96	3.39	4.29	3.79	3.32	3.97	3.38	3.32	2.14	3.84	3.91	3.48
Std Deviation	2.91	2.80	2.80	2.92	2.68	2.87	3.28	2.68	2.61	2.91	2.85	2.88
Q35D.TALK TO OTHERS RE: LOCAL												
Mean	3.00	3.94	3.78	3.77	3.21	3.69	4.42	3.21	2.43	4.06	3.56	3.75
Std Deviation	2.34	2.30	2.19	2.25	2.37	2.23	2.54	2.37	1.40	2.20	2.40	2.16
Q35E.TIMES PAST 6 MONTHS READ NP NEWSLETTER												
Mean	3.03	2.65	4.33	3.63	3.02	3.92	1.68	3.02	.86	3.67	3.35	3.64
Std Deviation	7.34	3.59	5.89	5.89	4.77	6.17	2.44	4.77	1.57	6.77	6.03	5.30
Q35F.ATTEND NP MTGS												
Mean	.40	.52	.50	.50	.55	.50	.17	.55	.14	.56	.75	.27
Std Deviation	2.19	2.78	1.59	2.16	2.39	2.35	.48	2.39	.38	1.52	2.97	.96
Q38.AGE												
Mean	41.13	41.74	43.88	44.27	36.25	46.05	35.63	36.25	33.00	37.84	42.82	42.31
Std Deviation	17.50	13.78	13.81	14.86	12.42	14.62	10.42	12.42	9.73	15.03	13.53	15.86
Q39.YEARS OF EDUCATION												
Mean	10.76	14.09	17.42	15.42	12.61	15.55	14.17	12.61	15.43	15.19	15.19	14.47
Std Deviation	2.25	.62	1.75	2.63	3.70	2.63	2.12	3.70	2.99	2.69	3.11	3.06
Q1.YEARS LIVED IN NORTH PARK												
Mean	10.31	11.18	10.45	11.19	8.90	11.39	7.29	8.90	1.43	9.28	9.78	11.65
Std Deviation	11.90	12.63	12.45	13.12	9.07	13.06	5.43	9.07	1.51	12.93	11.05	13.58

Demographic Variables

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
EXPOSURE TO MEDIA										
Mean	-.11	-.01	.12	-.18	.04	.09	-.02	.05	.14	-.07
Std Deviation	.51	.47	.55	.53	.51	.48	.53	.52	.53	.51
INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM										
Mean	.78	1.02	.97	.77	.88	1.16	.86	1.05	1.16	.79
Std Deviation	.81	1.08	1.00	.67	.95	1.23	.90	1.11	1.16	.83
NUMBER SOURCES IN COMMUNITY										
Mean	2.07	2.15	2.07	2.09	2.08	2.16	2.06	2.19	2.16	2.07
Std Deviation	.49	.43	.43	.45	.43	.46	.44	.47	.43	.45
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM PEOPLE/RADIO										
Mean	1.72	1.54	1.51	1.52	1.58	1.62	1.53	1.66	1.63	1.51
Std Deviation	.63	.48	.55	.60	.57	.48	.53	.55	.57	.51
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM COMMUNITY MTGS										
Mean	1.82	1.80	1.81	1.50	1.83	1.98	1.82	1.80	1.99	1.65
Std Deviation	.57	.65	.69	.49	.63	.67	.68	.58	.72	.53
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM TV/NEWSPAPERS										
Mean	1.91	1.89	2.03	1.83	2.04	1.93	1.95	1.93	1.99	1.89
Std Deviation	.82	.67	.77	.69	.78	.73	.73	.76	.74	.74
GOOD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM										
Mean	2.90	2.87	2.79	2.97	2.82	2.84	2.85	2.86	2.82	2.88
Std Deviation	.59	.59	.54	.54	.58	.58	.55	.63	.55	.59
BAD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM										
Mean	2.47	2.22	2.48	2.54	2.38	2.18	2.33	2.50	2.34	2.41
Std Deviation	.75	.72	.67	.73	.75	.63	.71	.74	.67	.74

	AGE			INCOME			MARRIED		OWN HOME	
	18-34	35-54	55+	<\$30K	\$30-60K	\$60K+	SINGLE	MARRIED	OWN	RENT
EXPOSURE TO MEDIA										
Mean	-.11	-.01	.12	-.18	.04	.09	-.02	.05	.14	-.07
Std Deviation	.51	.47	.55	.53	.51	.48	.53	.52	.53	.51
INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM										
Mean	.78	1.02	.97	.77	.88	1.16	.86	1.05	1.16	.79
Std Deviation	.81	1.08	1.00	.67	.95	1.23	.90	1.11	1.16	.83
NUMBER SOURCES IN COMMUNITY										
Mean	2.07	2.15	2.07	2.09	2.08	2.16	2.06	2.19	2.16	2.07
Std Deviation	.49	.43	.43	.45	.43	.46	.44	.47	.43	.45
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM PEOPLE/RADIO										
Mean	1.72	1.54	1.51	1.52	1.58	1.62	1.53	1.66	1.63	1.51
Std Deviation	.63	.48	.55	.60	.57	.48	.53	.55	.57	.51
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM COMMUNITY MTGS										
Mean	1.82	1.80	1.81	1.50	1.83	1.98	1.82	1.80	1.99	1.65
Std Deviation	.57	.65	.69	.49	.63	.67	.68	.58	.72	.53
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM TV/NEWSPAPERS										
Mean	1.91	1.89	2.03	1.83	2.04	1.93	1.95	1.93	1.99	1.89
Std Deviation	.82	.67	.77	.69	.78	.73	.73	.76	.74	.74
GOOD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM										
Mean	2.90	2.87	2.79	2.97	2.82	2.84	2.85	2.86	2.82	2.88
Std Deviation	.59	.59	.54	.54	.58	.58	.55	.63	.55	.59
BAD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM										
Mean	2.47	2.22	2.48	2.54	2.38	2.18	2.33	2.50	2.34	2.41
Std Deviation	.75	.72	.67	.73	.75	.63	.71	.74	.67	.74

Demographic Variables

	EDUCATION			LATINO		RACE					GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
EXPOSURE TO MEDIA												
Mean	-.16	-.02	.09	.03	-.09	.03	.05	-.09	-.33	.06	.02	-.01
Std Deviation	.59	.49	.49	.54	.53	.52	.56	.53	.42	.53	.59	.47
INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM												
Mean	.67	.88	1.07	.96	.74	.97	.83	.74	.86	1.09	.86	.97
Std Deviation	.65	.89	1.12	1.03	.68	1.03	.92	.68	.90	1.20	.95	.99
NUMBER SOURCES IN COMMUNITY												
Mean	2.14	2.06	2.11	2.06	2.26	2.04	2.23	2.26	2.09	2.03	2.06	2.15
Std Deviation	.51	.44	.43	.42	.51	.42	.45	.51	.69	.35	.41	.48
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM PEOPLE/RADIO												
Mean	1.59	1.56	1.56	1.50	1.88	1.49	1.64	1.88	1.53	1.58	1.53	1.60
Std Deviation	.64	.55	.51	.49	.68	.51	.53	.68	.46	.31	.52	.57
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM COMMUNITY MTGS												
Mean	1.67	1.70	1.94	1.81	1.82	1.78	1.85	1.82	1.89	2.11	1.82	1.80
Std Deviation	.56	.69	.63	.62	.78	.63	.60	.78	.19	.46	.64	.66
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM TV/NEWSPAPERS												
Mean	1.89	1.82	2.04	1.96	1.84	2.01	2.11	1.84	2.17	1.63	1.96	1.93
Std Deviation	.80	.70	.73	.74	.71	.74	.82	.71	1.04	.68	.73	.75
GOOD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM												
Mean	2.93	2.83	2.83	2.81	2.99	2.82	2.78	2.99	3.04	2.89	2.85	2.86
Std Deviation	.61	.60	.54	.56	.63	.54	.72	.63	.39	.59	.60	.56
BAD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM												
Mean	2.67	2.46	2.19	2.27	2.82	2.22	2.36	2.82	2.36	2.47	2.34	2.43
Std Deviation	.77	.74	.64	.68	.74	.66	.88	.74	.29	.66	.70	.75

Demographic Variables

	EDUCATION			LATINO			RACE				GENDER	
	0-12	13-16	17+	.00	LATINO	CAUCASIAN	AFR-AMER	HISPANIC	ASIAN	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE
EXPOSURE TO MEDIA												
Mean	-.16	-.02	.09	.03	-.09	.03	.05	-.09	-.33	.06	.02	-.01
Std Deviation	.59	.49	.49	.54	.53	.52	.56	.53	.42	.53	.59	.47
INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM												
Mean	.67	.88	1.07	.96	.74	.97	.83	.74	.86	1.09	.86	.97
Std Deviation	.65	.89	1.12	1.03	.68	1.03	.92	.68	.90	1.20	.95	.99
NUMBER SOURCES IN COMMUNITY												
Mean	2.14	2.06	2.11	2.06	2.26	2.04	2.23	2.26	2.09	2.03	2.06	2.15
Std Deviation	.51	.44	.43	.42	.51	.42	.45	.51	.69	.35	.41	.48
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM PEOPLE/RADIO												
Mean	1.59	1.56	1.56	1.50	1.88	1.49	1.64	1.88	1.53	1.58	1.53	1.60
Std Deviation	.64	.55	.51	.49	.68	.51	.53	.68	.46	.31	.52	.57
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM COMMUNITY MTGS												
Mean	1.67	1.70	1.94	1.81	1.82	1.78	1.85	1.82	1.89	2.11	1.82	1.80
Std Deviation	.56	.69	.63	.62	.78	.63	.60	.78	.19	.46	.64	.66
HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM FROM TV/NEWSPAPERS												
Mean	1.89	1.82	2.04	1.96	1.84	2.01	2.11	1.84	2.17	1.63	1.96	1.93
Std Deviation	.80	.70	.73	.74	.71	.74	.82	.71	1.04	.68	.73	.75
GOOD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM												
Mean	2.93	2.83	2.83	2.81	2.99	2.82	2.78	2.99	3.04	2.89	2.85	2.86
Std Deviation	.61	.60	.54	.56	.63	.54	.72	.63	.39	.59	.60	.56
BAD EFFECTS OF PROGRAM												
Mean	2.67	2.46	2.19	2.27	2.82	2.22	2.36	2.82	2.36	2.47	2.34	2.43
Std Deviation	.77	.74	.64	.68	.74	.66	.88	.74	.29	.66	.70	.75