

Table 13
**Distribution of the Number of Homeless Victims Reporting Frequency and
 Type of Victimization in 2001**

Type of Offense By Selected City	Number of Victimizations						Total Persons ¹
	1	2	3	4	5	>5	
Marysville							
Assault	1	0	2	0	0	1	4
Robbery	0	2	0	0	2	2	6
Forced Crime	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Rape	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Sacramento							
Assault	2	0	1	0	3	5	11
Robbery	3	4	0	0	0	6	13
Forced Crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Stockton							
Assault	4	3	1	0	0	0	8
Robbery	3	0	0	1	0	2	6
Forced Crime	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Rape	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Vacaville							
Assault	0	2	3	1	0	0	6
Robbery	1	2	0	1	0	1	5
Forced Crime	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rape	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Berkeley							
Assault	0	0	0	1	0	6	7
Robbery	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Forced Crime	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
Rape	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Oakland							
Assault	2	0	3	2	0	2	9
Robbery	1	1	0	0	0	8	10
Forced Crime	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rape	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
San Francisco							
Assault	2	0	4	0	0	1	7
Robbery	4	0	0	2	0	4	10
Forced Crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. >5 = between 6 and 365. Forced crimes included sexual assault of a minor, petty theft, robbery decoy, and participation in drug dealing activities. The total number of victimizations (127) exceeds the total number of victims (69) due to victimization of the same participant in more than one offense type.

¹ Total number of persons indicating victimizations for offense type category.

Table 14
Location of Homeless Victimitizations in 2001

Type of Offense By Selected City	Location of Victimitization	
	Indoors	Outdoors
Marysville		
Assault	2	2
Robbery	4	5
Forced Crime	1	1
Rape	1	1
Sacramento		
Assault	4	8
Robbery	3	10
Forced Crime	0	0
Rape	1	4
Stockton		
Assault	4	9
Robbery	4	4
Forced Crime	1	1
Rape	2	3
Vacaville		
Assault	4	4
Robbery	3	5
Forced Crime	1	1
Rape	1	1
Berkeley		
Assault	0	10
Robbery	1	7
Forced Crime	0	2
Rape	0	1
Oakland		
Assault	3	4
Robbery	4	6
Forced Crime	0	1
Rape	0	1
San Francisco		
Assault	2	5
Robbery	2	8
Forced Crime	0	0
Rape	0	0

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. Total victimizations in a city which are unequal to the number of homeless victims are due to victimizations of the same participant in more than one offense type. Forced crimes included sexual assault of a minor, petty theft, robbery decoy, and participation in drug dealing activities.

Table 15
Time of Day of Homeless Victimization in 2001

Type of Offense By Selected City	Time of Victimization	
	Day	Night
Marysville		
Assault	3	3
Robbery	4	6
Forced Crime	1	1
Rape	1	2
Sacramento		
Assault	3	10
Robbery	3	12
Forced Crime	0	0
Rape	1	5
Stockton		
Assault	3	6
Robbery	1	5
Forced Crime	0	1
Rape	0	3
Vacaville		
Assault	2	4
Robbery	3	4
Forced Crime	1	1
Rape	1	1
Berkeley		
Assault	5	8
Robbery	1	0
Forced Crime	1	1
Rape	1	1
Oakland		
Assault	4	3
Robbery	4	5
Forced Crime	1	0
Rape	1	0
San Francisco		
Assault	6	4
Robbery	7	6
Forced Crime	0	0
Rape	2	2

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. Total victimizations in a city which are unequal to the number of homeless victims are due to victimizations of the same participant in more than one offense type. Forced crimes included sexual assault of a minor, petty theft, robbery decoy, and participation in drug dealing activities.

Table 16
**Number of Homeless Persons Reporting That They Were Alone
 at the Time of Victimization in 2001**

Type of Offense By Selected City	Alone	Not Alone	Left Belongings Unattended ¹
Marysville			
Assault	2	3	-
Robbery	2	4	4
Forced Crime	1	1	-
Rape	1	1	-
Sacramento			
Assault	7	3	-
Robbery	7	3	3
Forced Crime	0	0	-
Rape	5	0	-
Stockton			
Assault	7	0	-
Robbery	3	1	2
Forced Crime	0	0	-
Rape	3	0	-
Vacaville			
Assault	2	2	-
Robbery	2	3	0
Forced Crime	0	1	-
Rape	0	1	-
Berkeley			
Assault	5	4	-
Robbery	6	2	0
Forced Crime	1	1	-
Rape	0	1	-
Oakland			
Assault	4	2	-
Robbery	7	2	0
Forced Crime	2	0	-
Rape	1	0	-
San Francisco			
Assault	3	1	-
Robbery	4	2	0
Forced Crime	0	0	-
Rape	0	0	-

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. Total victimizations in a city which are unequal to the number of homeless victims are due to victimizations of the same participant in more than one offense type. Forced crimes included sexual assault of a minor, petty theft, robbery decoy, and participation in drug dealing activities.

¹These are thefts.

**Table 17
Victim-Offender Relationship for Homeless Victimization in 2001**

Type of Offense By Selected City	Relationship to Perpetrator		
	Stranger	Acquaintance	Unseen
Marysville			
Assault	1	3	0
Robbery	3	5	4
Forced Crime	0	2	0
Rape	0	2	0
Sacramento			
Assault	2	10	0
Robbery	3	10	3
Forced Crime	0	0	0
Rape	0	5	0
Stockton			
Assault	2	8	0
Robbery	1	6	2
Forced Crime	0	1	0
Rape	0	3	0
Vacaville			
Assault	1	3	0
Robbery	1	3	0
Forced Crime	0	1	0
Rape	0	1	0
Berkeley			
Assault	1	7	1
Robbery	2	5	0
Forced Crime	0	2	0
Rape	0	1	0
Oakland			
Assault	2	6	0
Robbery	1	8	0
Forced Crime	0	1	0
Rape	0	1	0
San Francisco			
Assault	1	6	0
Robbery	2	8	0
Forced Crime	0	0	0
Rape	0	3	0

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. Total victimizations in a city which are unequal to the number of homeless victims are due to victimizations of the same participant in more than one offense type. Forced crimes included sexual assault of a minor, petty theft, robbery decoy, and participation in drug dealing activities.

**Table 18
Responses by Homeless Persons to Questionnaire Items Pertaining to Reporting**

Questionnaire Item By Selected City	Participant Response		
	Yes	No	N/A
Marysville			
Reported the crime(s)	0	9	8
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	0	0	15
Thought law enforcement officer cared	0	0	15
Sacramento			
Reported the crime(s)	3	12	1
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	1	2	12
Thought law enforcement officer cared	0	3	12
Stockton			
Reported the crime(s)	4	10	4
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	4	0	11
Thought law enforcement officer cared	2	2	11
Vacaville			
Reported the crime(s)	2	3	10
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	2	0	13
Thought law enforcement officer cared	0	2	13
Berkeley			
Reported the crime(s)	5	5	6
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	2	3	10
Thought law enforcement officer cared	2	3	10
Oakland			
Reported the crime(s)	5	6	4
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	7	3	5
Thought law enforcement officer cared	6	4	5
San Francisco			
Reported the crime(s)	4	8	4
Thought law enforcement officer believed you	4	1	10
Thought law enforcement officer cared	2	4	9

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. Total victimizations in a city which are unequal to the number of homeless victims are due to victimizations of the same participant in more than one offense type. N/A = homeless participant was not victimized, did not report the victimization(s), or was unable to recall due to mental illness, substance abuse, or vague memory.

**Table 19
Responses by Homeless Persons to Questionnaire Items
Pertaining to Anti-Homeless Crime**

Questionnaire Item By Selected City	Participant Response			
	Yes	No	Unsure	N/A
Marysville				
Victimized because of housing status?	3	5	1	6
Was the perpetrator homeless?	3	5	3	4
Sacramento				
Victimized because of housing status?	12	0	3	0
Was the perpetrator homeless?	11	1	3	0
Stockton				
Victimized because of housing status?	8	2	0	5
Was the perpetrator homeless?	9	5	0	1
Vacaville				
Victimized because of housing status?	4	0	1	10
Was the perpetrator homeless?	2	3	0	10
Berkeley				
Victimized because of housing status?	1	7	3	4
Was the perpetrator homeless?	2	5	2	6
Oakland				
Victimized because of housing status?	9	3	1	2
Was the perpetrator homeless?	5	4	3	3
San Francisco				
Victimized because of housing status?	11	0	0	4
Was the perpetrator homeless?	10	1	0	4

Note: n (number of homeless victims) = 7 in Marysville, n = 14 in Sacramento, n = 11 in Stockton, n = 6 in Vacaville, n = 9 in Berkeley, n = 11 in Oakland, n = 11 in San Francisco. Total victimizations in a city which are unequal to the number of homeless victims are due to multiple victimizations of the same participant. N/A = homeless participant was not victimized, did not report the victimization(s), or was unable to recall due to mental illness, substance abuse, or vague memory.

Table 20
**Summarized Statements of Survey Responses for
 Advocates of Homeless Persons in Each City**

Homeless Victimization Issue By Selected City	Summarized Response Statement
Marysville	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Funding needed for programs for homeless persons.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Increased police involvement needed.
Anti-homeless Crime	No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.
Sacramento	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs daily.
Prevention and Reporting	Implementation of preventative measures at shelters needed.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Crimes against homeless persons are not prosecuted.
Anti-homeless Crime	Anti-homeless crime perpetrated primarily by teenagers.
Stockton	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs daily.
Prevention and Reporting	Issues of substance abuse and mental illness should be addressed.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Increased police involvement needed.
Anti-homeless Crime	Frequently receives reports of anti-homeless crime.
Vacaville	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs with regularity but not on a daily basis.
Prevention and Reporting	Need separate shelters for single men and women and families.
Apprehension and Prosecution	More police involvement needed.
Anti-homeless Crime	Frequently occurs.
Berkeley	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs with regularity, but not as much as other California cities.
Prevention and Reporting	More practical services needed.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Crimes against homeless persons are not prosecuted.
Anti-homeless Crime	No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless community.
Oakland	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs daily.
Prevention and Reporting	More social services should be made available.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Crimes against homeless persons are not prosecuted.
Anti-homeless Crime	Frequently occurs.
San Francisco	
Prevalence	Victimization of homeless people occurs daily.
Prevention and Reporting	More social services should be made available.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Crimes against homeless persons are not prosecuted.
Anti-homeless Crime	Frequently occurs.

Note: n (number of advocates of homeless persons) = 3 in Marysville, n = 5 in Sacramento, n = 2 in Stockton, n = 3 in Vacaville, n = 2 in Berkeley, n = 6 in Oakland, n = 4 in San Francisco.

**Table 21
Summarized Survey Responses for
Law Enforcement Officers in Each City**

Homeless Victimization Issue By Selected City	Summarized Response Statement
Marysville	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Victims not reporting because of substance abuse issues.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Difficult without credible victim and/or witness.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.
Sacramento	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Victims not reporting because of substance abuse issues.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Difficult without means for contacting victim and/or witness.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.
Stockton	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Victims not reporting because of substance abuse issues.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Difficult without means for contacting victim and/or witness.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.
Vacaville	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs with regularity, not frequently. Not many homeless citizens.
Prevention and Reporting	Victims not reporting because of substance abuse issues.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Difficult without credible victim and/or witness.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.
Berkeley	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs with regularity, but not frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Reported but not tracked.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Treated the same as other types of victimization.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.
Oakland	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Issues of homelessness need to be addressed.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Prosecuted the same as other crimes.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.
San Francisco	
Prevalence	Homeless victimization occurs frequently.
Prevention and Reporting	Issues of homelessness need to be addressed.
Apprehension and Prosecution	Treated the same as other victimizations.
Anti-homeless Crime	Majority of perpetrators are homeless.

Note: n (number of law enforcement officers) = 1 in Marysville, n = 3 in Sacramento, n = 2 in Stockton, n = 2 in Vacaville, n = 3 in Berkeley, n = 3 in Oakland, n = 3 in San Francisco.

Table 22
**Summarized Survey Responses for
 Prosecutors in Each City**

Homeless Victimization Issue
 By Selected City

Summarized Response Statement

Marysville

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

No occasion to prosecute a crime against a homeless person.
 Strengthen existing prevention and reporting measures.
 Need credible victim and/or witness to prosecute.
 No experience with anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

Sacramento

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

Not aware of any cases involving a homeless victim.
 Enforcement of existing laws.
 No differences between homeless and domiciled victims.
 No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

Stockton

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

Not aware of any cases involving a homeless victim.
 Enforcement of existing laws.
 Homeless victim treated the same as any other victim type.
 No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

Vacaville

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

No occasion to prosecute a crime against a homeless person.
 Lack of reporting due to substance abuse and mental illness.
 Difficult to locate and communicate with victims.
 No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

Berkeley

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

No occasion to prosecute a crime against a homeless person.
 Lack of reporting due to substance abuse and mental illness.
 Difficult to locate and communicate with victims.
 No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

Oakland

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

No cases involving crimes against homeless persons.
 Lack of reporting due to substance abuse and mental illness.
 Difficult to locate and communicate with victims.
 No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

San Francisco

Prevalence
 Prevention and Reporting
 Apprehension and Prosecution
 Anti-homeless Crime

No cases involving crimes against homeless persons.
 Enforcement of existing laws.
 Need credible victim and/or witness to prosecute.
 No knowledge of anti-homeless crime in homeless population.

Note: n (number of prosecutors) = 1 in Marysville, n = 3 in Sacramento, n = 2 in Stockton, n = 1 in Vacaville, n = 2 in Berkeley, n = 3 in Oakland, n = 3 in San Francisco.

