



Oregon State Children's Mental Health Initiative

Initial Review of Cultural Competence

C. H. "Hank" Balderrama
Human Services Consulting, LLC
September 2005

**Oregon State
Children's Mental Health Initiative**

**An Initial Review of
Cultural Competence**

**C. H. "Hank" Balderrama
Human Services Consulting, LLC
September 2005**

Acknowledgements

This document was prepared with contributions from a number of people. Thanks to Madeline Olson, Ralph Summers and Kathy Seubert, of the Oregon Office of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OMHAS) who have provided guidance in understanding Oregon State's public mental health system and have contributed numerous suggestions that have improved the clarity and focus of this report.

Appreciation goes to the people from around the state who agreed to be interviewed and shared their knowledge of cultural competence within the OMHAS service system.

Rita Shaefer contributed statistical calculations, preparation of tables and guided the format of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
List of Recommendations by Section	3
I. Project Description	6
II. Demographics	9
III. Service Statistics	18
IV. Provider Service Capacity.....	25
V. Key Informant Survey	30
Appendices	
Demographic Tables	
A. Oregon Ethnicity by Percent and Number by County	48
B. Race/Ethnicity Grouping Statement by County and by MHO	54
Language Tables	
C. Statewide Summary of Languages Spoken Other than English by Age Group and Language Groups.....	59
D. Oregon Language Ability by Age Group by County.....	60
E. Oregon Language Spoken by MHO	72
Service Statistics Tables	
F. Comparable Access Ratio Appendix Narrative Statement.....	78
G. Statewide Comparable Access Ratios—Outpatient, Crisis, Inpatient.....	79
H. Statewide Comparison of Service Access by Population	84
I. Statewide Comparable Access Ratios—Crisis Services—by MHO by County	99
J. Statewide Comparable Access Ratios—Outpatient—by MHO by County	127
K. Statewide Comparable Access Ratios—Acute Community	155
L. Statewide Comparable Access Ratios—State Hospital	178
Provider Service Capacity	
M. Service Practitioner Reports Summary Table	200
Key Informant Survey	
N. Detailed Summary of Key Informant Responses.....	202
Biographical Sketch, C. H. “Hank” Balderrama	215

Children's System Change Initiative
Cultural Competence Review
C. H. Hank Balderrama
September 2005

Executive Summary

In summer 2004, The Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS) Office of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OMHAS) began to implement the Children's Systems Change Initiative. Community stakeholders requested a cultural competence review of the public mental health system.

In response, OMHAS released a request for proposals (RFP) in late 2004 to engage a consultant to conduct a strength-based cultural competence review of the Oregon mental health system's service delivery capacity. The contract was awarded to C. H. "Hank" Balderrama. The RFP required the development of a baseline of cultural competence in several areas: 1) population and language demographics; 2) service provider capacity to deliver specialized services; 3) service delivery data for indicators of who were served and what services were provided; 4) interviews with key informants to begin to identify existing and emerging culturally competent services.

As a result of the review, a set of recommendations were developed. They are intended to complement and expand upon the work already in progress at OMHAS and within the state. A list of general recommendations is presented immediately following this Executive Summary and at the end of each section of the report. Implementation Strategies, which expand upon the recommendations, are presented by section in this report.

The results of the review indicate that there are number of efforts to develop and deliver culturally competent services across the state already in progress.

Organizations have established cultural competence plans. Agencies have implemented specialized service approaches for target populations. Community specific traditional practices are being used. Efforts to develop bilingual and bicultural staff capacity to deliver mental health and substance abuse services are in progress. Work is conducted to document program structures and outcomes. OMHAS has revised the initial standards for evidence based practices as a step towards assuring culturally competent practices are available and recognized in the near future.

These state and localized efforts serve as the foundation for an intentional approach to building statewide capacity to deliver linguistically and culturally competent services for children and adults. Participants in the key informant survey consistently looked to OMHAS to formulate policy, set standards and assist and support efforts to develop cultural competence service capacity.

The need for OMHAS to do so is underscored by the passage of Oregon Senate Bill 267, which requires five state agencies, including OMHAS, to incrementally increase the level of state funds spent on evidence based programs annually. By July 1, 2009, OMHAS shall spend at least 75 percent of state moneys that it receives for programs that are evidence based.

This baseline review of information concludes that additional work must be conducted that will result in incremental expanded capacity to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse general population within the state. Among the most critical findings is that there are few, if any, programs and practices in use across the state that were reported to qualify as one of the 37 OMHAS approved evidence based practices (EBPs).

Current service capacity is not considered sufficient to meet existing and increasing service needs. Approved EBPs for the most part have not been standardized for special populations. Local emerging specialized practices are not generally recognized. The ability to increase culturally competent service capacity in Oregon will need to continue to provide for adaptation of approved practices to meet the needs of special populations and to recognize and approve emerging practices used by specialized providers.

The following general recommendations to the Office of Mental Health and Addiction Services have been formulated in light of the baseline descriptive information gathered. They are intended to provide a framework for increased capacity to serve various ethnic minority groups in a culturally competent manner, within the requirements of state and federal laws and regulations.

- Balance legislatively mandated implementation of evidence based practice with existing and emerging practice to assure adequate service access and results for racial/ethnic minorities.
- Establish a goal of comparable access to service and comparable outcomes across age and racial/ethnic groups.
- Provide leadership by setting policy and standards, supporting their attainment, and establishing a range of acceptable performance.
- Formulate indicators of access and outcomes across racial/ethnic groups.
- Set standards for linguistic service capacity and competence.
- Establish qualifications for Minority Mental Health Specialists, their utilization, and standards for practice and consultation.
- Provide leadership in additional development of service capacity in collaboration with stakeholders to:
 - Support emerging practices,
 - Assist in the dissemination of successful local efforts, and
 - Encourage cooperative ventures among mental health and substance abuse providers with allied partners

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY SECTION

DEMOGRAPHICS

- Establish a base population from which comparisons of access to service and related outcomes may be established among fifteen population groups composed of children, adults and elders who are African Americans, American Indians/Alaska Natives, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Caucasians and Hispanics.
- Document factors that enable accurate determinations of the numbers of recent immigrants and refugees, by location, to promote reasonable projections of their service needs.
- Develop and implement indicators of access to and results from service that will enable determinations of comparable access and outcomes.
- Establish and enforce a policy that requires service to limited English proficient individuals to be provided by qualified staff or interpreters and which prohibits use of family members or friends in place of qualified staff or interpreters.
- Translate vital documents such as client rights, consent to treatment and release of information into Spanish and other languages as provided for in federal guidelines.
- Develop or access a method to determine the proficiency of bilingual direct service staff and interpreters, and assure that it is implemented.

SERVICE ACCESS

- Adopt a policy to ensure comparable access to services and outcomes from service are achieved across age and racial/ethnic groups.
- Define and adopt measures of service access and outcomes by March 31, 2006 in collaboration with stakeholders, MHOs and provider agencies.
- Phase in a range of acceptable performance levels in providing service access and outcomes by age and racial ethnic groups in contract among service providers over a four year period, beginning July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2010.
- Establish a method to include language in data collection elements as an additional measure of comparable service access and outcomes.
- Establish a method to determine whether qualified staff and interpreters are serving limited English proficient individuals.
- Adopt and phase in more detailed or focused measures of service access and outcomes in contract beginning July 1, 2008.

-
- Provide technical assistance and support the implementation of access and outcome standards by identifying and disseminating information about practices that will lead to comparable access and outcomes.
 - Develop and publicize regular progress reports, by MHO and county groupings to encourage accountability and collaboration among all service providers.

PROVIDER SERVICE CAPACITY

- Establish qualifications for Minority Mental Health Specialists.
- Establish a policy which provides that racial/ethnic minorities served in the public mental health system will be served by a person who qualifies as a Minority Mental Health Specialist or by a person who receives consultation from such a specialist at critical treatment junctures.
- Provide support and assistance to contractors and sub-contractors in the implementation of the proposed standard for use of Minority Mental Health Specialists.
- Create a standard report, in an electronic format for all reporting entities to use when submitting their service practitioner information to enable determinations of levels of specialized service expertise.
- Review service practitioner reports annually, by MHO, and use them as a guide to target development of further specialized expertise.

KEY INFORMANT SURVEY

- Continue to work with legislative, community and provider organization stakeholders to address the need to carry out legislative mandate to implement evidence based practices and still preserve and promote culturally and specific practices that produce positive outcomes but are not yet demonstrated to meet best practice standards.
- Take a leadership role in documenting efforts that are being made to develop capacity to serve racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities by county and by MHO.
- Promote the development of evidence based practices by identifying specialized practices being used, encouraging collaboration among MHOs and provider agencies and assisting in the engagement of resources to establish emerging, promising and best practices.
- Promote additional development of service capacity by disseminating information about successful strategies to develop linguistic and cultural competency.
- Establish additional state level capacity to provide support and assistance to MHOs and provider agencies in establishing cultural competence capacity enhancement plans through assignment of qualified staff and/or contractual arrangements.

This report recognizes that there are many positive factors already in place within the mental health and addiction services system of care throughout state. The recommendations at the end of each section of the report are intended to be complementary of one another and to serve as a broader foundation to extend culturally competent care.

These recommendations put forth ways that OMHAS can increase or develop expectations and accountability in contract and in administrative rules that will provide for comparable access to services for people across age and racial/ethnic groupings. They also provide for the office to guide further development of specialized services through shared responsibility with its provider network and others.

OMHAS has the capability to use its role as regulator and payer to create and refine standards related to cultural competency. It also has capacity to continue to provide leadership by providing guidance and technical assistance to its service network and others that will support and enhance adaptations and innovations in the use of best practices from mainstream and minority communities.

I. Project Description

The Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), Office of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OMHAS) heard concerns from community stakeholders in late summer 2004. Some stakeholders expressed the opinion that the statewide mental health system did not have sufficient expertise and capacity to adequately serve children from racial/ethnic communities.

In response to those concerns, OMHAS released a request for proposals (RFP) in fall of that year. The RFP solicited a contractor to conduct a strength-based assessment of the current level of the Oregon mental health system's service delivery capacity to serve various ethnic minority groups in a culturally competent manner. It requested a review of general population data and service statistics. A survey of a variety of knowledgeable individuals throughout the statewide was required, as was a review of information about staff composition and specialized expertise to provide culturally competent mental health services.

The results of the project called for written recommendations for strategies to increase the mental health system's capacity to provide culturally competent care. Objectives were to be identified, using results of the strength-based assessment to promote increased capacity on an incremental basis.

The successful bidder to review mental health services for children and others from a culturally competent perspective was C. H. "Hank" Balderrama. He has more than 25 years experience in promoting cultural competence at the community, state and national levels. He founded and directed two private non-profit organizations, has served as a senior administrator in the Washington State Mental Health Division and has participated on national level panels on cultural disparities and cultural competence. He has consulted independently on numerous projects, which includes work with Multnomah County Mental Health and Addictions Services Division and Cascadia Behavioral Health's Project Respond between 2001 and 2005.

This assessment of cultural competence is a descriptive study. It includes a compilation and a review of demographics by county, mental health organization (MHO) and state population groupings. Demographic tables were developed that afford the ability to determine where various racial/ethnic groups are concentrated. This informs where culturally competent services by specific groups are likely to be needed.

Information about language spoken at home, an indication of language fluency, was documented. This serves as an indicator of need for services by limited English proficient individuals and will assist in projection of additional language capacity needed among mental health service staff.

A measurement of access to service was developed. It is referred to as Comparable Access (CA) ratios. The percentage of sub-groups of people in the general population is compared to their percentage in the service population.

Management information was compiled by three types of services: crisis, outpatient and inpatient hospitalization, for both community and state hospitals. This is intended to afford an initial look at service access by age and ethnicity across broad service types. A review of these three services helps to identify whether some groups are in more restrictive care and higher cost services at rates higher than others. It is also an indicator of other possible disparities.

While use of CA ratios is a gross measure of access, it serves to:

- promote establishment of baseline measures of comparable access,
- serve as a useful indicator of potentially undesirable service patterns and,
- indicate where additional review needs to be concentrated.

This method is a promising foundation on which to base initial impressions about comparable access to services and comparable service outcomes across age and racial-ethnic groupings.

Provider service qualifications, to the extent available, were reviewed. OMHAS requires MHOs to submit annual mental health practitioner reports that document various characteristics of direct service providers. The potential value of a review of service practitioner qualifications information is to assess the current level of specialized service capacity in relation to indicators of service need and access to service. The future objective will be the ability to project sufficiency of staff service capacity in comparison to projected need for age, linguistic and culturally specific competent services.

The final assessment step incorporates interviews with a diverse group of key informants throughout the state. OMHAS staff assisted in the identification of key informants throughout the state. A relatively small but representative group of consumers, consumer advocates, direct service providers, program managers, MHO administrators and OMHAS staff were interviewed. One or more people were interviewed from each MHO. There was a mix of racial-ethnic diversity among participants.

Key informants were asked about their knowledge of demographics within their service areas. They were requested to describe their understanding of service needs among local residents. They were asked about barriers to services, how the barriers might be addressed and who is responsible to do so. In addition, they were asked to state what their agency and others are doing to address service barriers.

Informants were encouraged to project how one might know or measure whether and when sufficient capacity to meet service needs has been met. Finally they were invited

to identify any culturally specific emerging, promising or best practices being developed or in practice either locally or elsewhere.

The purpose of the informant survey was to gather additional information about service needs and capacity to meet it. It also was useful as an indicator about the collective level of knowledge among key people contributing to policy making and operations of the public mental health system.

In summary, this review of cultural competence within the state mental health system is intended to address a number of questions.

- Who are potential service recipients?
- What services do they need?
- Who is serving them?
- What do we know about progress in meeting their service needs?
- How might we better prepare service providers to meet the needs?
- How should we measure our progress?

The following sections of this report provide details about each area of review. Each of the specific areas of this review contains information about what was examined and how the results might be used locally. Appendices provide supporting details and facilitate additional review of state, county or MHO level data.

Recommendations are listed at the end of each section. A list of recommendations resulting from this review is provided immediately following the Executive Summary on pages 3 and 4 of this report.

Tables and graphs in this report have been compiled at the state, Mental Health Organization and county level for the most part. Information is presented consistently from state to MHO to county levels. This affords an opportunity to identify patterns at the highest level and to view detailed information at the local level.

A set of graphs begins on page 80 of this report. The graphs illustrate at state and MHO levels Comparable Access (CA) ratios for minority groups, by age. Following the graphs are tables that provide detailed information. The tables present general and service population demographics by number, percent and CA ratio by age group.

Supporting information is provided for each section of this report in the appendices.

II. DEMOGRAPHICS

Data Examined

Several sets of data from multiple sources were examined. Census and language information for the general population of Oregon was compiled from the U.S. Census Bureau Internet web site. Census tables SF 3- PT 10 and SF 4-PT 38 were major sources of data.

OMHAS provided a copy of "Racial & Ethnic Diversity in Oregon: State, County & Census Tract Diversity Pyramids, Maps, Charts and Tables", by Evans, Stickler and Kelly, Oregon Department of Human Services, 2002. This manual is an excellent comprehensive set of tables that enabled statewide and local pictures of information related to the characteristics of the residents of the state of Oregon.

The methodology used in this cultural competence review distinguishes among Hispanic and non-Hispanic groups. U.S. Census data collection methodology does not consider Hispanics to be a racial group. Census procedures list basic groups of Caucasian (White), African American, American Indian-Alaska Native, Asian-Pacific Islander and mixed race categories. Once an individual selects a racial group, an option to identify as Hispanic is also available. There are sub-sets of Hispanics an individual may select such as Cuban, Mexican American, Puerto Rican and others.

For purposes of this study, Hispanics were grouped together. Thus there are five major racial/ethnic groups reported in this review. They are four non-Hispanic groups of Whites, African Americans, American Indians/Alaska Natives, and Asian/Pacific Islanders. There are also Hispanics, who may have reported themselves as one or more of the racial categories, including "Other"

There are at least two emerging populations groups in Oregon that are not readily detailed from U.S. Census Bureau data. Each of those groups is known to be present in Oregon, but Census Bureau procedures do not readily lend themselves to identification of them. Alternate sources of reliable data were not examined. There is, however, readily acknowledged presence of northern African and former Soviet Union and eastern European immigrants in Oregon.

U.S. Census Bureau data on languages spoken within the state is an indirect indicator of the presence of these two population groups. It is not, in itself, a sufficient data source to determine numbers of Soviet, eastern European and northern African Immigrants by local areas. Reliable sources of information will need to be consulted for details about the presence of these groups in future reviews.

Demographic information was compiled for 15 population groups: children, adults and elders by five racial/ethnic categories. Data was compiled for county, mental health organization and state levels.

Specific information about numbers and percentages of population groups is contained in Appendices A and B.

Language information also was documented. Data tables at the state level provide information about numbers of people who speak a language other than English in broad categories. Data at the MHO level provides information specific to particular languages. Information at the county level indicates, by age group, ability of people to speak various languages. One may reasonably project where staff capacity should be developed and prioritized for development by reviewing data presented.

Language data presented at the MHO level is grouped only by youth and adults, including older adults. This is due to the fact that separate information for adults and older adults was not available through Census data.

Rationale for Review of Population and Language Data

Use of U.S. Census Bureau data, while subject to limitations, is the nationally accepted standard for population information. It is important to determine potential service populations in order to project service need. Census information has been used in this report to examine age, racial/ethnic and language needs of potential service recipients as a step towards quantification of needed cultural and linguistic service capacity. Federal requirements and guidelines establish the responsibility to meet unique needs.

Assumptions

This review assumes that the need for mental health services is relatively equal among all population groups. Various stressors may tend to increase the need. Factors include lower socio-economic status, lack of access to housing and health care services, recentness of immigration, post traumatic stress and various other variables.

This review also assumes that recipients of federal and other public funds have an obligation to assure equal access to services and similar results. Federal regulation at 42 CFR 438.207 requires that a state must ensure, through its contracts, that each managed care organization gives assurances to the State and provides supporting documentation that demonstrates that it has the capacity to serve the expected enrollment in its service area. People who must demonstrate eligibility for services are primarily affected.

The Federal Register: August 8, 2003 (Volume 68, Number 153) issued, "Guidance to Federal Financial Assistance Recipients Regarding Title VI Prohibition against National Origin Discrimination Affecting Limited English Proficient Persons. This applies to any potential recipients of services. Eligibility is not a consideration.

The guidance indicates that some actions will be considered strong evidence of compliance with a federal funding recipient's written-translation obligations. Those actions include:

The federal funding recipient provides written translations of vital documents for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes five percent or 1,000, whichever is less, of the population of persons eligible to be served or likely to be affected or encountered. Translation of other documents, if needed, can be provided orally.

If there are fewer than 50 persons in a language group that reaches the five percent trigger the recipient does not translate vital written materials but provides written notice in the primary language of the LEP language group of the right to receive competent oral interpretation of those written materials, free of cost.

These provisions apply to the translation of written documents only. They do not affect the requirement to provide meaningful access to LEP individuals through competent oral interpreters. Oral interpretation of documents may not substitute for translation of vital written documents.

Vital documents are summarized as those which are critical to informed participation in services. They may include, for instance, intake, consent and complaint forms, any forms with potential for important health consequences, written notices of eligibility criteria, rights, denial, loss, or decreases in benefits or services, actions affecting parental custody or child support, and other hearings, notices advising LEP persons of free language assistance, written tests that do not assess English language competency, but test competency for a particular license, job or skill for which knowing English is not required, or applications to participate in a recipient's program or activity or to receive recipient benefits or services.

Limitations of the Data

U.S. Census Bureau data is collected each ten years, the last being in 2000. The demographics of any given geographic area of Oregon and other states are fluid. Population information becomes dated soon after the nationally accepted data is compiled and reported. Population data examined in this report is for the general population. Seasonal farm workers and other populations that will influence the level of need for services are not included in this descriptive review.

Census bureau data does not contain sufficient information to accurately identify characteristics that are important in a study of service need. One may not determine whether a person is a recent immigrant or a refugee. Ability to speak a language is determined by self-report, which, in itself, is influenced by the knowledge and understanding of the person being interviewed.

Caveats

OMHAS is, in essence, a safety net for people without other resources. A decision will need to be made about whether another population base should be used instead of the general population to project service needs. One alternative is the group of people at or below 200% of federal poverty level.

Information about recent immigration, refugee and migrant season worker status has not been documented, although these are important factors to be considered. To increase reliability of projections, alternate reliable sources need to be included in future reviews.

Findings

Statewide totals and percentages of race/ethnic groups are as follows:

Population Group	Total	Percent
White, non-Hispanic	2,584,969	78.64%
African American, non-Hispanic	51,123	1.56%
American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	40,604	1.24%
Asian, non-Hispanic	90,686	2.76%
Hispanics	275,314	8.38%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	7,442	0.23%
Other, mixed race, non-Hispanic	236,791	7.2%
Total	3,286,929	100.00%

Within the state, 78.6% of the people are Caucasian or White. The total of other population groups is 21.4%. The 2000 census is the first census that provided a choice of citing mixed race status. In the 1990 census count, approximately 47% of Hispanics reported they were of White race; approximately 48% reported they were of "Other" race; the remaining 5% reported they were one of the remaining race categories. Details of the following charts are at Appendix B.

African Americans

The African American population is concentrated primarily in western, urban settings.

Counties	Population
16	Less than 200
8	200 - 500
6	500 – 1,000
4	1,000 – 5,000
Washington	5,000 – 10,000
Multnomah	40,000+

Multnomah County, with a population of 40,000 plus, represents more than half of the state's population of African Americans.

American Indians/Alaska Natives

American Indians are located throughout the state. There are nine federally recognized tribes in the state. In addition, there are significant populations of American Indians concentrated in major urban centers of the state.

Counties	Population
5	Less than 200
7	200 - 500
5	500 – 1,000
14	1,000 – 5,000
4	5,000 – 10,000
Multnomah	10,000+

The four counties that have populations of 5,000 to 10,000 American Indians/Alaska Natives have no reservations. Only Multnomah County has a population of greater than 10,000 but fewer than 25,000.

Asians

Asians also are concentrated in Western Oregon, primarily in urban centers.

Counties	Population
12	Less than 200
5	200 – 1,000
6	1,000 – 5,000
2	5,000 – 10,000
Clackamas	10,000 – 15,000
Washington	25,000 – 40,000
Multnomah	40,000+

Hispanics

Hispanics are distributed throughout the state. While they are often located in rural areas, approximately half of the populations are located in urban centers. They are a mix of first and subsequent generations. Other population groups tend to have more homogenous age distributions. Hispanics tend to have a smaller contingent of older adults and a larger contingent of single males than other groups. This suggests that there are a significant number of recent immigrants among them.

The OMHAS "Racial & Ethnic Diversity in Oregon" document notes that there are almost 100,000 migrant and seasonal farm workers in Oregon. They are located primarily in the I-5 corridor and in the near urban counties. They are not included in Comparable Access ratio calculations.

Counties	Population
5	Less than 200
6	200 – 1,000
14	1,000 – 5,000
4	5,000 – 10,000
Marion Multnomah Washington	40,000+

Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders

The Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders is the smallest identified population group, with about two-thirds, or 22, of the state's counties realizing 200 or fewer residents.

Counties	Population
22	Less than 200
8	200 – 500
Jackson	500 – 1,000
5	1,000 – 5,000

No counties are reported to have greater than 5,000 resident Hawaiians.

Demographic information was examined for Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, but the small total number of them in the general population did not lend itself to a meaningful statistical examination of Comparable Access.

Russian, Former Soviet Union Immigrants, Northern Africans

No population statistics were readily available for these groups of people. There are anecdotal reports of significant increases population groups within the last ten to fifteen years in various parts of the state. Members of these groups have physical

characteristics similar to mainstream Americans. Their recent immigration and refugee status, language abilities and other factors make them remarkably different in their service needs and access characteristics

It is important to gather additional information about them. Alternate data sources will need to be contacted for information about these emerging populations.

Languages Spoken Other Than English

Some people may be surprised by the number of people in Oregon who speak a language other than English. A total of 428,975 people (13% of the state's population) in all age groups reported speaking a language besides English. This total is reflective of all individuals who spoke another language, irrespective of whether they spoke English very well to not at all.

Statewide there are 26,410 youth who speak English "Not Well" or "Not At All". These youth and others who speak English not well or not at all may be considered limited English proficient (LEP). Among LEP youth, Spanish is the most frequently reported language. A total of 18,432 Spanish speaking youth may be considered LEP. The remaining 7,978 LEP youth speak Indo-European, Asian/Pacific Islander and Other languages.

Among adults, 114,428 reported speaking English not well or not at all. Spanish speaking LEP individuals totaled 83,119. All other languages reported by adults totaled 31,309.

There are relatively few individuals in the older adult population of the state who may be considered to speak English on a limited basis. A total of only 9,440 people aged 65 and older were reported to speak English not well or not at all. Of those, 4,515 spoke Indo-European languages; 3,267 spoke Asian languages. This finding is consistent with the demographic finding that Hispanics in the state tend to be young adults with an emerging group of youth but relatively few elders.

In general, the presence of people who speak languages other than English is consistent with the distribution of racial-ethnic groups. Minority group members tend to reside along the I-5 corridor, especially in urban settings. The exception to this is the group of Hispanics, who also tend to reside in rural areas.

A related finding, to be addressed in the Provider Service Capacity section of this report, is that language ability of direct service providers is not tracked consistently. The personnel qualifications review seems to indicate there is insufficient capacity to provide mental health services to people in their own language. This appears to pose a significant barrier for many people. Information obtained from key informants tends to support this notion.

There is insufficient information available to determine the languages spoken by provider staff at either the professional, paraprofessional or other staff levels. There also is no consistent formal means to determine the language proficiency of staff who are responsible to communicate with LEP individuals.

The ability to determine how many staff speak a language other than English and how well they communicate in that language is an important consideration. Clearly there are many people in the state who are likely to require mental health services in an alternate language.

DEMOGRAPHICS RECOMMENDATIONS

A great deal of demographic data is available to and is used by OMHAS already. It will be important to formalize a method to track and update age and racial/ethnic data on a regular basis as a means to document the level of need for linguistically and culturally competent service capacity in light of continually increased diversity throughout the state.

- Establish a base population from which comparisons of access to service and related outcomes may be established among fifteen population groups composed of children, adults and elders among African Americans, American Indians/Alaska Natives, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Caucasians and Hispanics.
- Document factors that enable accurate determinations of the numbers of recent immigrants and refugees, by location, to promote reasonable projections of their service needs.
- Develop and implement indicators of access to and results from service that will enable determinations of comparable access and outcomes.
- Establish and enforce a policy that requires service to limited English proficient individuals to be provided by qualified staff or interpreters and which prohibits use of family members or friends in place of qualified staff or interpreters.
- Translate vital documents as client rights, consent to treatment and release of information into Spanish and other languages as provided for in federal guidelines.
- Develop or access a method to determine the proficiency of bilingual direct service staff and interpreters, and assure that it is implemented.

EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

OMHAS is responsible to provide service to Medicaid eligible people and others with limited access to services. General population data has been used in this report to

compile comparable access information. Consideration needs to be given to using an indicator of low income such as people at or below 200% of the federal poverty level.

In order to document information about people with recent immigration status, government and private agencies that specialize in serving refugees will need to be contacted. They will be able to provide accurate and reliable counts of recent immigrants, by location, who are likely to require specialized mental health services and who are often eligible for support during transition periods. Compilation of this information will be useful in projecting the level and location of projected service need.

In addition to use of comparable access ratios, by service modality, other indicators will be useful in measuring access and outcomes. Service penetration rates are used in some states. Stakeholders will have recommendations for other measurable indicators of access to service.

Washington has developed a system to test language proficiency among its social and health services and contracted interpreters that has been in place for more than ten years. Superior court systems have processes to certify interpreters for court proceedings. It is not necessary for OMHAS to establish a method to certify direct service providers or interpreters. Arrangements for testing may be made with other established agencies, and cooperative ventures are an option.

III. Service Statistics

Data Examined

The types of data sets examined in this study are:

Data Set	Source	Population Base
Outpatient Services by County	CPMS	Oregon Census Data
Crisis Services by County	CPMS	Oregon Census Data
Outpatient Services by MHO	MMIS	Oregon Census Data
Inpatient Services by MHO	MMIS	Oregon Census Data
Acute Community Hospital) by State	OPRCS	Oregon Census Data
Long Term (State Hospital) by State	OPRCS	Oregon Census Data

CPMS = Client Processing and Monitoring System

MMIS = Medicaid Management Information System

OPRCS = Oregon Patient/Resident Care system

General population data was compared to service data. The comparison process used a "Comparable Access" ratio (CA). For purposes of this review, Comparable Access ratio is defined as the comparison of a sub-population's representation in the service population to its presence in the general population. If a sub-population composes 4% of the general population in a geographic area (state, county, MHO), one might expect that the same sub-population should be approximately 4% of the service population.

Service data used in this study was provided by the Department of Human Services (DHS) Office of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OMHAS). That office also provided Oregon Census information. Comparisons of presence in the general population to presence in the service population were made among five population groups: African-American non-Hispanics; American Indian/Alaska Native non-Hispanics; Asian/Pacific Islander non-Hispanics; Caucasian or White non-Hispanics and Hispanics. Data was compiled by state, MHO, and county groupings.

Finally, data among the five major racial/ethnic groups was compared among three age groups, children, aged 0 to 17; adults, aged 18 to 64 and elders, aged 65 and over.

Rationale

For purposes of this study, three types of data were examined by age and race/ethnicity. This afforded an opportunity to compare basic access to crisis, outpatient and inpatient mental health care by age and racial/ethnic groups at county, MHO and state levels.

Basic access is defined merely as the appearance of an individual in a particular type of service, irrespective of other measures. If a person was enrolled in outpatient services, no distinction was made between attendance at one session or multiple services.

This initial review is intended to identify service patterns that bear further examination and which support the need for efforts to expand service capacity based on preliminary findings. In the future, more detailed or focused examination is merited.

Assumptions

The goal of a culturally competent system is to provide relatively equal or comparable access to services for people of all ages and backgrounds. Results of service or outcomes also are expected to be comparable among service recipients even when the methods to achieve them may vary. Achievement of comparable access and outcomes is considered to be cost effective and humane.

The "ideal" CA ratio of 1.0 is virtually impossible to achieve for any particular group. The comparison of the ratio of people in the service population to the ratio of their representation in the general population is a general indicator of service access. The CA is considered an indicator of whether one or more populations are "under-represented" in some services and perhaps "over-represented" in some services. Figures significantly above or below a CA ratio of 1.0 are considered indicators which merit further examination and serve to identify whether where additional action must be taken.

Variance in CA by age group for a particular service category is considered more acceptable than variance in the same category among racial/ethnic groups. As an example, children are likely to be physically healthier than elders. Thus it may be understandable to find a higher percentage of elders than children in restrictive settings due to infirmity or other physical considerations. That level of variation is based on characteristics that are age based.

Variation among ethnic groups in the same service category is not considered as acceptable. The finding that one group has significantly higher or lower rates of access to a given service deserves further examination.

Limitations of the Data

Only broad race/ethnicity comparisons were compiled as a result of data availability. Additional factors such as gender, detailed race/ethnicity and language ability are not included in this report.

Reliability of the data is highly dependent on the accuracy of the reporters of it. Multiple data sources were used, and there was some variability among them, depending on the data examined.

Caveats

Use of a ratio to a ratio comparison is not considered a statistically reliable calculation. One should be cautious to take into consideration CA ratios over time and the effects that smaller populations in an MHO or county service area may have on statistical calculations. The smaller the numbers involved, the less reliable the comparison becomes.

When reviewing detailed Comparable Access information presented in Appendices F through L, care should be exercised to review both percentages and numbers served. For children's crisis services, American Indian children have a relatively higher CA ratio of 2.93, but only 133 children were served. Caucasian children have a significantly lower CA ratio of 0.67, but 1,430 children were served.

Use of a CA ratio is considered a useful indicator nonetheless, inasmuch as it serves to indicate where more sophisticated measures of review need to be pursued.

Findings

Statewide CA ratios are presented for Outpatient, Crisis, Community Inpatient and State Hospital services on the next page of this report. Commonly used terms for racial/ethnic groups are used due to space considerations in the presentation. Details, including specific numbers served are found in Appendix G. CA ratios specific to MHOs are presented in Appendix I and J.

	OUTPATIENT				COMMUNITY INPATIENT			
	Children	Adults	Elders	All Ages Combined	Children	Adults	Elders	All Ages Combined
White	1.27	1.13	0.31	1.09	0.18	1.35	0.28	0.87
Hispanic	1.13	0.55	0.42	0.73	0.07	0.47	N/A	0.30
Asian	0.50	0.87	1.59	0.38	0.04	0.59	N/A	0.40
Indian	2.78	1.99	0.55	3.10	0.24	1.32	0.66	0.90
Black	4.50	2.71	0.80	1.22	0.63	1.33	0.83	2.82

N/A indicates none were reported.

CRISIS

STATE HOSPITAL

	All Ages				All Ages			
	Children	Adults	Elders	Combined	Children	Adults	Elders	Combined
White	0.67	1.50	0.33	1.09	0.36	1.50	0.62	1.05
Hispanic	0.45	0.92	0.37	0.73	0.15	0.88	N/A	0.57
Asian	0.28	0.44	0.23	0.38	0.33	1.17	N/A	0.85
Indian	2.93	3.46	0.28	3.10	0.84	2.21	N/A	1.60
Black	0.95	1.49	0.26	1.22	2.09	6.87	5.60	5.15

N/A indicates none were reported.

Statewide

Children's Intensive Treatment Services

Day Treatment 2004

Ethnic	unique served
Asian	3
African American	46
Hispanic	19
American Indian	22
Unknown	17
White	463

Residential Treatment 2004

Ethnic	unique served
Asian	3
African American	70
Hispanic	30
American Indian	72
Unknown	64
White	853
Other	1

pulled by JCC from MMIS 5/05

Only statewide data is provided. There is no appendix related to Children's Intensive Treatment services due to the fact that the small numbers of racial/ethnic minority children served make it difficult to draw reliable conclusions from the data.

In general, Caucasians as a group and by age groups were closer to the "ideal" CA ratio of 1.0 than others. Where there was significant variance from CA in a particular age group or service category, Caucasians generally remained closest to the desirable ratio.

Statewide results indicate that African Americans and American Indians/Alaska Natives tended to have high Comparable Access ratios in outpatient services, an indication that they are enrolled at rates higher than their rates in the general population. The state level results also indicate that both of those groups have high CA ratios in inpatient settings.

One might expect to see inpatient service access lower than for outpatient among these two groups, based on the assumption that effective outpatient service is expected to minimize the need for inpatient services. The finding of higher inpatient access does not, in itself, indicate that outpatient services are not effective. It does, however, indicate that African American and American Indian population groups in Oregon are being served in inpatient settings at a rate higher than others, a finding that deserves to be studied further.

Opposite indications were found for Asians and Hispanics. They tended to have low CA ratios both for outpatient and for inpatient services. This is not considered an indicator that these two groups have lower need for inpatient services. It is an indicator that they receive these two services proportionately less than others and that more needs to be done to understand this finding.

There were relatively few children and elders, by number, in state hospital and inpatient settings. The reliability of the data is affected as a result. It will be useful to examine in greater detail whether the children and elders are hospitalized primarily by one or by multiple sources and to determine what needs to be done about that.

Relatively few children statewide were reported to have used crisis services. A total of 1,430 Caucasian children were served. The next highest group, Hispanics, totaled 153. Other groups had smaller totals served. The CA ratio for American Indian children was 2.93, but the total served was 133.

Significant numbers of children of all racial/ethnic groups received outpatient services. African American (4.50) and American Indian (2.78) children had the highest CA ratios. Asian children (0.50) had the smallest CA ratio and the fewest served; there were a total of 276. Hispanic children had a CA ratio of 1.13. By comparison, the CA ratio for Hispanic adults was 0.55. This is likely due largely to eligibility for service differences, as noted among multiple key informants.

A general pattern was noted for adults. Caucasians are at or above 1.0 CA in Crisis, Outpatient, Community Inpatient and State Hospital service categories. African Americans and American Indians tend to have comparable or higher CA ratios in all service categories than Caucasians. Asians and Hispanics tend to have lower CA ratios than other groups for inpatient services.

While the total number of people served is relatively small, African American adults realized the highest CA ratio for state hospitalization. The CA ratio is 6.87, followed next by American Indians at 2.21. It will be useful to examine other service considerations such as length of stay and recidivism rates.

Older adults as a group consistently had lower CA ratios in all service categories than children and adults. Elders also totaled the fewest numbers served. With few exceptions, people 65 and older realized CA ratios of 0.50 and lower.

Statewide only 455 people age 65 and older were reported to have used Crisis Services. Of those, 431 were Caucasian.

Asian elders had a CA ratio of 1.59 in Outpatient services. Due to the small number of people served, it is possible that one program in Multnomah County that specializes in serving older Asians may have contributed significantly to the higher CA ratio. Insufficient details were available to examine that possibility.

African American elders had a CA ratio of 5.60 at State Hospitals, a finding that is consistent with other indications of restrictive care for children and adults within this major population group.

Graphs titled "Statewide Comparison of Service Access by Population Groups" are provided in Appendix H. These graphs illustrate ranges of service access by population group by MHO. A CA ratio well below 1.0 is considered an indicator that bears further examination equal to a rating well above 1.0.

Appendices G through L display CA ratios for crisis, outpatient and inpatient services. They are listed by state, MHO and county groupings

SERVICE ACCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

Service data already is compiled in a manner that will facilitate monitoring of service by age and racial/ethnic groupings. Determinations need to be made about a baseline for service comparisons. More specific performance standards and accountability measures need to be formulated and put in place to allow for determinations of comparable access to service to be made on an ongoing basis.

- Adopt a policy to ensure comparable access to services and outcomes from service are achieved across age and racial/ethnic groups.
- Define and adopt measures of service access and outcomes by March 31, 2006 in collaboration with stakeholders, MHOs and provider agencies.
- Phase in a range of acceptable performance levels in providing service access and outcomes by age and racial ethnic groups in contract among service providers over a four year period, beginning July 1, 2006.
- Establish a method to include language in data collection elements as an additional measure of comparable service access and outcomes.
- Establish a method to determine whether qualified staff and interpreters are serving limited English proficient individuals.
- Adopt and phase in more detailed or focused measures of service access and outcomes in contract beginning July 1, 2008.
- Provide technical assistance and support the implementation of access and outcome standards by identifying and disseminating information about practices that will lead to comparable access and outcomes.

- Develop and publicize regular progress reports, by MHO and county groupings to encourage accountability and collaboration among all service providers.

EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Stakeholders will need to be consulted to formulate potential measures of access and outcomes. Base population determinations will need to be made, e.g. use of general population data or low-income population data.

Acceptable ranges of performance will need to be established. Variation in performance is to be expected, and establishment of an acceptable level of variation will be important to establish.

A performance baseline will need to be set for each individual MHO by whatever measures are adopted. If, for example, use of a comparable access ratio is the measure of access, a baseline performance is set for calendar year 2005. If an MHO realized a CA ratio of 0.25 for given population group, it is reasonable to ask that half the difference between a CA ratio of 1.0 and 0.25 or attainment of a CA ratio of 0.50 is expected within a two year period. In the following two year period, improvement by half the difference is expected again. In the third biennial period, attainment of 1.0 becomes the performance standard. Thus transition is incremental, and diversity in service is achieved during normal consumer attrition in service.

This report includes only an overview data provided to OMHAS by MHOs of service practitioners. It does not include a review of data forms used to collect information about consumers and services they receive. If there are no methods in place to determine primary language of people served, data collection fields will need to be added to consumer service documentation forms. Likewise if there is no method to determine whether the consumer was served in the person's primary language, it will be necessary to address the need to document that also.

Future, more detailed measures of access and outcomes also will need to be developed in collaboration with stakeholders. Examples of access include: The number of contacts, by race/ethnicity, is comparable for outpatient services. The frequency of use of crisis services is not significantly higher or lower in one group as compared to others. Examples of outcomes are: The length of stay at hospitals is similar among various population groups. Use of seclusion and restraint varies only slightly. Rates of return to employment or other meaningful activities are similar among racial/ethnic groups.

IV. Review of Provider Service Capacity

Rationale for Review of Service Provider Qualifications

The intent of the review of direct service provider or service practitioner qualifications was to try to determine whether and how many bilingual, bicultural or bilingual and bicultural staff were present in each service area. The intent was also to begin to identify which direct service providers already have attained advanced credentials and specialized expertise to serve racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities. OMHAS provided available practitioner reports, as submitted by MHOs.

Assumptions

The ability to examine consistent, detailed direct service provider information will assist in a comparison of service patterns to available specialized personnel. Identification of desirable service patterns in areas where qualified staff are known to deliver services potentially is a key indicator of the utility of those personnel. The ability to establish parallel patterns between desirable service patterns in the presence of qualified staff will lead to more informed statements about where service capacity needs to be developed to address disproportionate or undesirable service patterns.

Limitations of the Data

OMHAS receives reports from Mental Health Organizations (MHOs) related to service practitioner staff and their qualifications. Reports were provided in hard copy; electronic copies were not available. Service practitioner characteristics information was available only for seven of the nine MHOs.

There is significant variance in the formatting of the reports. Accordingly there is variation in the data reported. In general, service practitioners are listed by name, by amount of time worked, by practitioner type, practitioner educational or professional designation and information related to individual specialty. Some reports appear to place more emphasis on one aspect than on others. One report contained detailed information about staff language capability; other reports did not include this information.

Caveats

There is great variation in formatting and information reported among the various MHOs. The data set available was incomplete. Consequently the attempt to establish baseline information was abandoned. Recommendations for data to be collected in the future are provided below.

Findings

The number of service practitioner staff reported tallied in the hundreds among the seven reports provided. A simple table was created to provide an organized review of the varied reports. Review of the table did not produce sufficient comprehensive and reliable information on which to base definitive statements. The following observations were possible.

- There is consistency in identification of the practitioner, by name, and general credentials.
- There is variation in the format of the report even when submitted for separate counties within the same MHO.
- The reports usually include the number of hours worked per person and whether they are employed or on contract.
- Most reports indicate the practitioner is a QMHP or a QMHA. In cases where practitioner level is not identified, there isn't always an explanation.
- Specialty areas of practice are identified broadly and inconsistently among reports.
- A wide range of practice specialties were identified. They included children, adults and geriatrics. More specific specialties also were identified such as families, dual diagnosis, skills training, Crisis, Psycho-social Rehab, SPMI, Gambling, juvenile rehab, parenting, FSAT, Anger management, Suicide prevention, developmental disorders, eating disorders, grief and trauma.
- In cases where an MHO provided specialty practice information for staff, it wasn't always possible to determine the geographic location in which the person practices. This is a limitation particularly for multiple county MHOs.
- One agency identified language specialties. Among them were Mien, Cambodian, Bosnian, Hispanic, Vietnamese, Kurdish, Lao, Ethiopian, Somali, Russian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, Tagala (sic), and Farsi.

Compilation of staff qualifications is a sound practice. It is consistent with requirements in federal regulations at 42 CFR 438.207 and guidelines published in the Federal Register August 8, 2003, V. 68, No 163, to determine service capacity in relation to service needs. OMHAS is commended for gathering staff qualifications information and in moving in the direction of encouraging MHOs and provider agencies to make informed decisions about where and to what extent they should develop staff capacity.

There is consistency in reporting among reporting organizations in the areas of professional and non-professional credentials and amount of time worked by individual practitioner. There is also regularity in reporting service practitioner specialties. One agency reported language specialties.

There was variation in reporting formatting and information reported. Reports were not available from all providers in all areas of the state.

A standardized report will serve as the foundation upon which to base comparisons of general population demographics and service population statistics.

Accordingly an informed service practitioner characteristics report will promote the ability of provider agencies, MHOs and OMHAS to identify areas where service capacity is needed.

In addition to the service practitioners characteristics fields currently collected, key fields need to be added to the report to promote knowledge of language and practice specialties. Those fields include:

- Age Specialty—children, adults or elders
- Race/Ethnicity Specialty—African American, American Indian, Asian-Pacific Islander, Hispanic and former Soviet Union, with an option to state other groups
- Language spoken with proficiency other than English
- Practice specialties such as dual diagnosis, PTSD, DBT, eating disorders and other unique practices may be gathered for use by MHOs.

The goal of the use of practitioner data is to align practice specialties with the need to address undesirable service patterns.

Note: A person may be bicultural or bilingual but may not have practice specialty expertise. A person becomes a specialist in serving a particular group through study and practice specialization. Qualification as a specialist in serving a particular racial/ethnic group is a bona fide occupational qualification which may be achieved irrespective of a person's individual personal characteristics.

PROVIDER SERVICE CAPACITY RECOMMENDATIONS

Information about the qualifications of practitioners already is gathered. Additional data about linguistic and cultural competencies and about staff service specialties need to be incorporated into service practitioner reports. Practice standards, competencies and methods need to be developed further. It will be important to work towards the development of linguistic and cultural competencies among service practitioners on a level that is consistent with changing demographics in order to promote comparable access to service and to set a solid foundation for comparable outcomes.

- Establish qualifications for Minority Mental Health Specialists.
- Establish a policy in which racial/ethnic minorities served in the public mental health system will be served by a person who qualifies as a Minority Mental

-
- Health Specialist or by a person who receives consultation from such a specialist at intake, at critical treatment junctures.
- Provide support and assistance to contractors and sub-contractors in the implementation of the proposed standard for use of Minority Mental Health Specialists.
 - Create a standard report in an electronic format for all reporting entities to use when submitting service practitioner report information that enables determinations of levels of specialized service expertise.
 - Review service practitioner reports annually, by MHO, and use them as a guide to target development of further specialized expertise.

EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

When creating an electronic service practitioner report, definitions of key terms need to be developed for standardized service practitioner reports. A basic, short set of instructions need to be provided.

Basic qualifications for Minority Mental Health Specialist need to be that the individual practitioner has an advanced degree in a mental health related field, at least one year of experience specializing in serving a specific population groups (i.e. African Americans, American Indians, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Hispanics and former Soviet Union eastern European immigrants), and a minimum of 100 clock hours of specialized training related to serving racial/ethnic minorities in general.

A practice standard for use of specialists to serve minorities or for general practitioners to consult with specialists at critical treatment junctures must be phased in over a period of five years from date of adoption.

Critical treatment junctures occur at consumer initial assessment or intake, upon usual review of consumer progress, prior to placement in restrictive care and especially when involuntary placement is involved, upon discharge and when there is a significant change in a consumer's circumstances.

Access to consultation from specialists to general practitioners needs to be prioritized for practitioners who are working to become Minority Mental Health Specialists to expand access for minority consumers and foster the development of additional specialized staff.

Support from OMHAS for implementation of the use of minority mental health specialists needs to include facilitation of the development of a training program for specialty practitioners and development of specialized assessment instruments that factor culturally specific consumer characteristics.

Practice protocols need to be developed for use in consultation between minority mental health specialists and generalists to promote improved practice and service results.

Agencies that use culturally specific interventions or intervention tools and other unique service approaches must be supported through encouragement and assistance in documenting emerging, promising and evidence based practices.

V. Key Informant Survey

Rationale for Key Informant Survey

The intent of interviewing a knowledgeable group of people throughout the state was to obtain a description of the mental health service system's current state of development through the impressions of people who are familiar with it. Key informant interviews serve to gain a basic understanding of what specialized service capacity exists already. Anecdotal reports, combined with review of available objective information, are complementary.

Method for Gathering Information

All individuals interviewed were contacted prior to the interview. The purpose of the interview was explained. Each of the people requested to participate agreed to do so; no one declined.

Survey participants were provided a copy of the survey materials in advance of the survey at their option. Most of them received materials in advance.

A set of questions was used to gather information about the respondent's knowledge of service area demographics and service needs of the various populations residing in the area. Respondents were asked to describe barriers to service and efforts to address them. Informants were also asked about how to determine sufficiency of service capacity and about their knowledge of emerging and best practice.

Respondents were informed that their individual responses would remain confidential. No responses are attributed to or are attributable to any specific respondent. All results are based upon aggregate or grouped responses.

Assumptions

Use of key informant interviews is an effective method to gather descriptive data. While the information gathered may not be statistically reliable it is still significant. General impressions are useful as indicators of baseline information and existing practice. Anecdotal reports often lead to the ability to focus efforts.

Limitations of the Data

A total of seventeen people were interviewed. At least one individual was interviewed from each of the nine MHOs in the state. Fourteen counties were represented among

informants in the survey. Seven of the respondents were from eastern Oregon counties; others provided information about rural areas outside the I-5 corridor.

Twelve women and five men were interviewed. Two members of each racial/ethnic group were interviewed, except for Asians; no representatives of that group were interviewed.

Family members and advocates were approximately 25% of people interviewed. There were representatives from affiliated agency and university settings. One person was an MHO administrator. Several people were managers or administrators at provider agencies; others were direct service practitioners at both the professional and paraprofessional levels.

Caveats

The bulk of the strengths identified throughout the OMHAS service system were identified through the key informant survey. Attempts to distill them and still do justice to reporting them have been difficult.

All responses were first reviewed and summarized. Responses to questions about direct service providers were not considered sufficiently reliable to include them in this report. A significant number of informants were not able to respond with confidence about the accuracy of their statements about service practitioners. Consequently this report does not include additional service practitioner information from the interviews.

Key Informant responses were reviewed and edited for inclusion of this report. The "Detailed Summary of Selected Key Informant Responses" at Appendix N provides more details about the impressions of respondents, their responses and the remarkable amount of promising work that is taking place within Oregon.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

What population groups appear to be more prevalent in your service area?

Each of the respondents was able to respond to this question readily. Some of them had specific or informed estimates of the percentage of a specific group within the county or service area. Some respondents had age specific information such as the presence of unaccompanied male Hispanics resulting from recent immigration or the percentage of White adults being significantly larger than the percentage of White children in the service area.

Several respondents mentioned emerging former Soviet Union and eastern European immigrants as well as northern African refugees and immigrant communities. Those responses came from respondents primarily in urban settings.

In general each of the respondents had a basic to advanced knowledge base about the presence of various population groups in the service area. A few appeared to have taken time prior to the interview to gain additional information and were able to respond in more detail than others. It is apparent that there is great awareness of the presence of diverse populations among key informants. It is not as apparent that the informants, as a group, have used confirmed demographic information as a base to target services to diverse populations.

What services do they need?

A full range of services were reported to be needed. Irrespective of the population group, respondents indicated that services are affected by cultural factors such as belief systems and behavioral norms that vary from mainstream practices in accessing mental health and substance abuse service.

In addition to culturally competent outpatient and crisis services, specialized services such as detoxification services for adolescents and residential treatment for Hispanic women were noted. Outreach services are needed in order to engage people in need of services but who aren't familiar with service availability or who may not relate to generalized service modalities. Peer support services were mentioned as an effective intervention.

Linguistic ability to serve people in their preferred language is a major service need frequently identified. Key informants also indicated that racial/ethnic minorities often relate better to a person from their culture or origin or at least a person who has experience working with a particular group.

Some of the respondents to the survey provided group specific responses. For example African Americans were said to need services for depression and anxiety, particularly related to life stressors such as prejudice, oppression and negative community events such as police shootings. In addition to transitional issues and inter-generational conflict among newly arrived Hispanic immigrants and their children, domestic violence and substance abuse services were noted.

American Indian/Alaska Native people were considered to need treatment for depression and PTSD along with interventions for addictions and substance abuse. Asians were said to need crisis services because of their lower acceptance of services and greater likelihood not to access them. Eastern European and former Soviet Union people were reported to have needs for assistance in transition, be affected by stressors from being separated from traditional support systems, and require linguistic accommodations. Their access to service is affected by stigma and negative perceptions of mental health interventions.

Linkages to other services and supports were also reported to be important for all minority groups. Connections and easy access to community resources such as schools, churches, and other provider agencies were considered significant. Respite care, after school and summer school activities were reported to be needed. People were reported to need mental health, substance abuse and related services in their own language, in accordance with their cultural in a way that they can relate to them consistent with their every day lives.

What services are available?

There is a promising array of services available now and more are being developed around the state. There are four types of service delivery arrangements that were identified from the responses of the key informants.

- Use of specialized staff at mainstream agencies in general assignments

A number of mainstream agencies have hired individual or small numbers of staff with bilingual and bicultural specialized service capacity. They are employed within the general agency setting. These staff may provide in agency or outreach services. The agency is early in its stage of staff and program development to meet specialized service needs. This model appears to be found more frequently outside urban settings.

- Use of specialized staff at mainstream agencies where there is focus specifically on one or more populations

Some mainstream agencies have developed a focused program to serve one or more specific population groups. A group of staff specialize in providing outreach, crisis and other outpatient mental health services to target racial/ethnic groups within the service area. These staff may provide training and consultation to general practitioner staff in order to expand the level of expertise available to meet service needs.

- Community based services that are provided by and within group specific communities

A few community based population specific agencies have begun to develop mental health or substance abuse intervention services. The number of staff who are available to provide services remains limited, but they do have specialized knowledge of the needs of their target populations and an understanding of how those services should be provided. Bilingual master's level practitioners and community outreach paraprofessionals are both used to engage and serve members of the target community.

- Cooperative arrangements between mainstream mental health or substance abuse agencies with community based agencies that service specific communities

Mainstream agencies also are beginning to establish working agreements with minority community based agencies that provide health and related services but haven't yet established mental health or substance abuse service capacity. Professional and paraprofessional mental health personnel are hired by the licensed local provider. The mental health providers are then out-stationed to a health clinic or social service agency that has already established itself in the local minority community.

Each of the nine federally recognized tribes around the state appears to have established mental health and substance abuse outpatient treatment services at varying levels of capacity. Residential services remain limited, and inpatient services continue to be provided outside of tribal operations. The need for services on and off reservations is considered to continue to exceed service capacity.

A number of agencies have begun to "grow their own". Staff with limited training and expertise are being hired and supported in their professional growth. Some mainstream agencies have formulated and are implementing cultural competence plans. Boards of directors have recruited members of minority communities and otherwise engaged communities to guide them in delivering acceptable and competent services.

One urban based agency has established a multi-cultural team of bilingual, bicultural staff with a specialized mission to serve all of the five major racial/ethnic groups in the service area. The team members are Asian, African American, American Indian, Hispanic and eastern European in origin. They have multi-lingual abilities. Their charge is threefold.

- They provide direct intervention services on a crisis and short term basis.
- They deliver training to general practitioners to assist their understanding of the need for and value of culturally competent services.
- They are available for culturally specific consultation to generalist practitioners who are serving racial/ethnic minority consumers of service.

There is a rural based county that has mental health outpatient services available in Spanish offering intensive outpatient and residential alcohol and drug treatment.

Are there barriers to service?

All survey respondents agreed that there are barriers to service.

What are the barriers?

Among the most frequently identified barriers were:

- Stigma and difference in understanding of mental health and substance abuse treatment among racial/ethnic minorities and providers of service, including lack of familiarity with availability of services and the need to offer services such that racial/ethnic people will relate to them
- Lack of eligibility for services and benefits
- Lack of linguistically competent and clinically trained practitioners to serve specialized service needs
- Insufficient community based organization capacity to deliver services and a need to increase partnerships with them to maximize the reach of established mental health and substance abuse providers
- The need to engage potential service consumers by focusing first on basic human needs such as housing, employment, and health care prior to focusing on mental health or substance abuse treatment through active outreach efforts.

What might be done of a tangible nature to address the barriers?

Responses to this question were grouped into four categories. The responses below are reflective of the solutions put forth by key informants.

Staffing

The state needs to take a leadership role to assure that there are sufficient levels of staff available to meet the specialized needs. We need to develop a work force for the future. We should develop professionals from their communities of origin.

Respondents said it is important to recruit and retain bilingual and bicultural direct service staff at provider agencies. They also said it is important to recruit and retain bilingual, bicultural staff at agency, county and state level management and administrative levels.

Students who are placed in clinical and administrative internship positions need to come from more diverse groups.

One organization pays a salary differential for staff that is culturally competent.

Administration

State and federal funding must be used to assure that linguistic and culturally competent services are available. Funding allocations should have provisions to assure equal access to service.

Agencies that know how to provide health and other human services to minority communities are not as well established in delivering mental health and substance abuse services. Mental health agencies don't have a minority community base. Cooperative arrangements need to be fostered among mental health organizations and community based agencies that already serve racial/ethnic minorities to expand the availability and acceptability of services.

The state should include geographic distance in its funding formula. There needs to be more funding for indigent services and more flexible funding in serving children.

OMHAS needs to assure that ethnic demographic and service data is reviewed at the state and local level. The data should be the basis to determine where adjustments in services need to be made.

The state needs to take more leadership in standards, training and clinical practice. Oregon Administrative Regulations ought to be examined for changes to promote better access and clinical standards. OMHAS needs to assure that policies and procedures as well as service standards are developed and put in place.

OMHAS should provide technical assistance to mainstream and community based agencies in the provision of culturally competent services. OMHAS should conduct workshops for minority community based organizations to bid on services.

Counties need to be held accountable for how funds are distributed to assure equal access to services. Mainstream providers must be accountable for serving all populations.

Performance based contracts are needed. They should promote the development of minority service programs and providers.

Clinical Approaches

Clinicians should ask about patient concepts of illness and processes of healing. There need to be culturally competent methods of accurate diagnosis. Clinicians need to be willing and able to explain variations in services to consumers on their own terms.

There should be bilingual, bicultural staff to provide services. Liaisons should be developed within communities to include working relationships with indigenous healers.

Culturally based diagnostic tools need to be developed and used. Consumer evaluation needs to include assessment of cultural and family strengths as well as community strengths.

Community Involvement

Outreach to diverse communities needs to occur. Communities should be involved in planning services they need. Mainstream providers should have guidance from culturally specific providers and professionals to serve people from specific groups.

There needs to be coalition building among the diverse communities and shared knowledge as programs are developed.

Parent involvement should be assured and increased at every level of decision making.

Who might be responsible to address the barriers?

Policy makers are responsible to make changes.

This needs to be a multi-system approach. Purse holders have a responsibility to form standards and measurements. Provider management and boards need to commit resources and assure they are targeted.

OMHAS is responsible to address the disparities by clearly stating that counties have a mandate to provide demonstrated access and setting standards. There are no apparent staff people at OMHAS responsible to work with counties to do this. Community leaders from respective minority groups need to participate in shaping policy and practice.

Administrators are responsible to address systemic barriers. Clinicians are responsible to learn new techniques.

Are there current efforts that your agency is making to improve service capacity for the various population groups?

A number of notable efforts are taking place around the state. Examples are listed below in no specific order, as reported by key informants.

When OMHAS offers training, they try to make sure that there are funds for minority and rural communities. OMHAS is developing distant learning opportunities.

One organization monitors the number of new clients seen on a monthly basis by age and ethnicity. The same organization matches consumers with staff who can best meet their needs.

One agency has developed a business plan to expand service capacity for racial/ethnic minorities. The plan is to have teams of community health workers and licensed clinical therapists engage the community. The same agency holds community groups that are educational in nature but which provide for assessments for mental health and substance abuse to be conducted and referrals for service to be made.

More than one agency is "growing their own". They have in-house methods to recruit and train direct service staff to meet the needs of minority consumers.

An affiliated agency, that doesn't deliver mental health services, still provides recommendations about service needs of the target population to mental health providers. Agency staff are developing continuing education programs for direct service staff that address practices changes including specialized counseling skills.

One organization makes multiple efforts. There is a cultural relations department and a strategic plan to develop cultural competence that has been endorsed by management and the organization's board of directors.

This organization has a very active cultural relations committee that monitors and implements the cultural competence plan. There is a team of cultural specialists staffed by a group of multi-ethnic mental health specialists that provide direct services, training and consultation to other staff in the organization.

The same organization employs a limited English proficient coordinator who is responsible to track and review incidents within the agency related to language and service provision.

Direct service and other personnel receive training in delivering culturally competent services. Training is specific to particular minority groups. The organization provides and supports culturally specific programming for African Americans in-house and for Latinos through a multi-agency project in the community.

The organization produces a quarterly report of ethnic clients served and ethnic staff who serve them. Goals for improvement are formulated based on results of the reports.

Another agency has used paid practicum placements to promote additional development of qualified service staff.

Still another agency has begun to establish partnerships with a community based health clinic. The mental health agency hires staff and stations them at a satellite office within the health clinic, where clients are more likely to access and accept services. The agency is also involved in using a "braided care" approach to delivery of services. Clinicians are able to access funds from various sources to provide support and assistance to mental health clients.

The number of bilingual professionals is tracked, and gradual improvement has been recognized elsewhere. Penetration rates also are monitored and have increased gradually. There are bi-monthly specialized staff team meetings.

There is an alcohol and drug abuse intensive outpatient and residential program for men in Spanish. The program has served 28 of 26 counties to date.

One agency hired an outside consultant to help them be more culturally competent and diverse. Implementation of the recommendations is pending.

What efforts are other individuals or agencies making to improve service capacity for the various population groups? What are the other efforts?

There are several specialized community based agencies in Multnomah County that target American Indian adults and youth, Hispanic, Asian, and refugee communities for delivery of mental health and substance abuse services, all on an outpatient basis.

An urban American Indian program has developed capacity to identify employment opportunities for their target population.

Four community based social service agencies have formed an affiliation to develop Latino mental health services.

Some mental health providers are using mentoring and internships to develop staff capability.

A family to family training program was designed by NAMI and has been translated into Spanish. An affiliated agency uses a Spanish language curriculum to teach families about the dynamics of mental health.

A methamphetamine task force has been convened in one county. The task force includes faith based, corrections and treatment providers to address this drug problem. City, county and tribal goals are the same, and they are looking for coordinated solutions.

Health care clinics have developed partnerships with mental health providers and have established limited independent internal mental health service capacity.

How will your agency know whether and when sufficient service capacity has been established?

Responses to this question were grouped into three categories.

Indirect Indicators

There will be diverse representation on policy and decision making groups and governing bodies.

Recovery celebrations will have even more people participating.

When you can walk into a mental health place and know that you can get the help you need, we'll be there.

It's difficult to know when services are sufficient, because there are people who don't access services and population groups that are under-estimated.

Data Based Indicators

We will be able to know when penetration rates are comparable between mainstream and other communities. Outcome data from indicators such as high end services like crisis hospitals and jails will be comparable across groups.

Services will be sufficient when we see outcomes that are fairly equitable. If 13% of the mainstream population has favorable access and outcomes, we should expect to see comparable results for minority populations.

People will be able to tell when the methamphetamine problem is cut in half and there aren't long waiting lists for treatment services.

If hospitalization is low but alternatives to hospitalization are high, we are doing a good job.

We should expect that the service and administrative workforce should be representative of the groups in the community.

Consumer Satisfaction Indicators

If I went to minority community leadership and they indicated satisfaction with the level of service capacity, that would be a good measure.

We will know when there are no complaints from families and when people seek services on their own.

It wouldn't work just to do a satisfaction survey. People may not even be there to survey if they weren't served well in the first place. Focus groups need to be employed.

Are you aware of any culturally competent emerging or best practices?

Concepts

Some respondents were concerned about implementation of best practices. The current momentum to adopt them seems to assume that anything not identified as best practice isn't a good practice.

Best practice involves folks who are culturally aware and involve families and a broader social network like friends and clergy.

Emerging Practices

One of the respondents reported that everybody at the agency gets a cultural inventory at intake.

There is a crisis center that has services available in Spanish and bicultural staff.

A multi-ethnic team of cultural specialists has been in operation for well over two years. They provide short term and crisis intervention services, conduct training for general practitioners and offer consultation to practitioners who are serving racial/ethnic minority individuals.

At least one substance abuse provider has developed intensive outpatient and residential treatment services for men in Spanish.

One organization has a grant to document the work of their African American dual diagnosis work. The funds are specifically to establish a promising practice.

Use of Talking Circles is one effective practice, but it's not an officially recognized practice. Sweat lodges are also successful. Another is Back to the Boards, use of traditional baby boards for Native communities. Some people are using challenge courses, and others have adopted rights of passage programs that help youth come of age and be influenced and supported by their elders. At least one tribe is using the Family Unity model, where families decide what is best for them and have wraparound services.

Related and Collaborative Efforts

Use of cultural competence plans within an agency is an emerging but undocumented practice.

Some programs have begun to translate and adapt established interventions into other languages.

Collaborative efforts among community based organizations and established mental health agencies to develop and deliver services to target populations are occurring.

Placement of mental health workers at outstation locations such as health clinics and other community based sites is becoming more common.

Community Involvement

Use of NAMI translated curriculum materials is one step.

Families are working with provider staff to design individual service plans.

The state family networks put together a book on the subject of cultural competence within the last year. The subject of the statewide family network in June 2005 was cultural competence.

Is there anything else you think is important for me to know about mental health and related services to children and ethnic minority populations in your county or service area?

One of the things that would make a huge difference is for DHS to assist communities to develop real partnerships. DHS should promote, encourage and support local partnerships to increase use of limited dollars.

It's urgent that the OMHAS be taking seriously and putting priority on the needs of people in light of changing demographics. Service to minority groups has been an add-on. It needs to be part of core services even if it means cutting back services to others who have had more of an advantage.

When we think of systems of care, what do we consider to be essential elements? Does this perspective include natural helpers? That includes indigenous healers. We create systems of care with formal providers, but we don't include spiritual, recreational, socialization and meaningful employment in the equation. One of the

best predictors of good health is a good job, including good benefits. We need to see that in our service delivery.

Who does the state have for advisors? Do they have a representative group of people helping to share policy?

FINDINGS

The participants in the key informant consistently look to OMHAS to set policy and standards for access and results from service.

There is general agreement that the capacity to meet the need for linguistic and cultural competence in serving racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities is insufficient.

There are pockets of excellence around the state that can serve as models for others to emulate.

There are a number of clinical and associated practices that are considered culturally competent around the state. They are traditionally based, time honored and used effectively within the respective community. Such practices are not formally documented or recognized to meet evidence based practice standards. They do, however, appear to produce positive results for minority consumers.

Evidence based practices have, for the most part, been standardized in mainstream, adult communities. Thus unrecognized culturally specific practices employed within the state are no less tested than existing EBPs for use with racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities. Accordingly EBPs have no greater demonstrated results for racial/ethnic communities than untested community specific interventions.

Significant, creative and highly promising methods to increase culturally competent service capacity exist in both urban and rural settings. These efforts appear to be taking place in relative isolation.

DISCUSSION

Oregon Senate Bill 267 requires that five state agencies, including OMHAS, will incrementally change the expenditure of state funds. By July 1, 2009, OMHAS must expend at least 75% of state moneys on evidence based programs.

Of the 37 evidence based practices or programs identified by OMHAS, none clearly indicate that they were standardized for specific cultural or ethnic groups. The approved practices have been standardized as evidence based in mainstream adult settings. As of August 2005, no practices recognized as evidence based by Oregon appear to apply specifically to racial/ethnic minorities.

There is a need to assist providers of culturally specific services in the implementation of approved evidence-based practices. This will require use of existing practices or adaptations of them for specific communities. In addition, many of these providers will need significant technical assistance to document the outcomes associated with culturally specific treatment approaches that have not yet been researched or approved as EBPs. As OMHAS takes steps to expand the use of evidence-based practice they should also assist providers to demonstrate practice based evidence of the utility of community specific interventions.

There is a need to assure that comparable access to service and comparable outcomes from service are accomplished. It appears that the existing services provided are not sufficient to engage and serve some population groups to meet the apparent need. This appears to be the case now irrespective of whether the intervention has been recognized as best practice.

A major challenge presents itself and must be accomplished in less than four years. Additional service capacity needs to be developed to meet the needs of minorities. Concurrently 75% of state funded practices need to be recognized as evidence based by July 1, 2009. The challenge is to assure that the level of culturally competent practice that meets state legislative requirements is sufficient to meet the level of service needs of Oregon's diverse population on a timely basis within limited available funding.

OMHAS already has recognized this challenge and has taken initial action to address it. As of May, 2005, the initial Oregon standards for evidence based practice were revised. The revisions are intended to recognize culturally competent and other practices that produce positive outcomes and to include them as best practices.

The momentum to pursue and fund primarily evidence based practices has emanated largely from the New Freedom Commission Report. A number of states have embraced the mandate enthusiastically. Transition at the systemic level, however, takes place slowly.

It does not appear that the Oregon legislature provided targeted funding to assist OMHAS to provide technical assistance or financial support to assure that provider organizations will be able to meet the standards put forth in SB 267. Development of culturally competent services in Oregon is still in its early stages.

Informed estimates indicate that it takes as much as 10 or 15 years from the time a practice is initiated until it is demonstrated to be a best practice. Even if strict scientific methods are not used as a measure of best practice, resource and time consuming efforts will be needed at systems and provider levels to reach the goal of demonstrating that local culturally competent practices are standardized, replicated and demonstrated to achieve consistent positive outcomes by the required date.

Historically culturally competent mental health service expertise has come from community based organizations within minority specific neighborhoods. Such organizations often operate on smaller budgets. Yet they have done two things well: they have engaged and provided effective services to their target populations better than others, and they have managed to access funding to provide those services.

Accomplishment of those two achievements has taken virtually all of the energy and resources of minority based organizations. There has been little left to engage in scientific or other rigorous exercises to demonstrate the validity and effectiveness of their efforts by mainstream standards.

The Oregon legislation significantly restricts use of state funds by mid 2009. It is reasonable to project that mainstream mental health agencies will adopt or adapt existing recognized evidence based practices as a primary way to assure continuity of funding and to minimize disruptions in service to the greatest number of their consumers as one means to meet the deadline.

It will take an unpredictable amount of time for agencies that work with culturally competent practices to demonstrate that those are effective and evidence based practices. Additional resources need to be accessed. Methodologies must be formulated formally. Protocols need to be documented. Constructs to demonstrate effectiveness have to be conceptualized, initiated and completed.

Emerging culturally focused community based community mental health programs may have to forego demonstration of their effectiveness during the process of developing and shaping their models and service approaches. Partnerships between mainstream mental health and community based minority agencies do not have access to readily available culturally competent best practice models, largely because nationally they haven't been documented, demonstrated and published. It won't be possible to "take models off the shelf" and implement them easily.

Even more well established Oregon mainstream agencies engaged in culturally competent practices are challenged in major ways to demonstrate that their alternative approaches for ethnic minorities meet even the revised standards for best practices adopted by OMHAS in May 2005. There is only one agency reported by key informants that intentionally has begun the process to achieve the standards. It provides services targeted to a single ethnic minority group. That agency has accessed funds to begin to document and demonstrate the effectiveness of their practice. Other programs are not known to have started the process to meet the standards.

The potential for minority practices to meet Oregon legislative requirements is not a question of good will. It is a matter of feasibility and whether there are sufficient resources and time available to assure an acceptable of culturally competent

practice that meets institutional standards. To do so timely is at least a major challenge.

Additional work remains to be focused on promotion of emerging culturally specific and effective but undocumented practices. Mental health system leadership will need to continue to prioritize support and tangible assistance to providers of emerging practices to increase the likelihood that culturally competent practices meet systems definitions of acceptability. Failure to do so has the unfortunate potential to result in emerging or promising practices having to be discontinued or to be funded from limited alternate sources. The undesired consequence will be a reduced capacity to meet specialized needs.

KEY INFORMANT SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The people who participated in the Key Informant survey identified a large number of service strengths. Among those strengths are a large number of innovative practices that appear to occur in relative isolation. The informants look to OMHAS to provide continued guidance and technical assistance to promote more cohesive efforts in building a coordinated culturally competent system of care.

- Continue to work with legislative, community and provider organization stakeholders to address the need to carry out legislative mandate to implement evidence based practices and still preserve and promote culturally and specific practices that produce positive outcomes but are not yet demonstrated to meet best practice standards.
- Take a leadership role in documenting efforts that are being made to develop capacity to serve racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities by county and by MHO.
- Promote the development of evidence based practices by identifying specialized practices being used, encouraging collaboration among MHOs and provider agencies and assisting in the engagement of resources to establish emerging, promising and best practices.
- Promote additional development of service capacity by disseminating information about successful strategies to develop linguistic and cultural competency.
- Establish additional state level capacity to provide support and assistance to MHOs and provider agencies in establishing cultural competence capacity enhancement plans through assignment of qualified staff and/or contractual arrangements.

EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

MHOs are surveyed to determine whether and what evidence based or best practices are being used currently. Survey information includes where existing evidence based

practices are being adapted for use with special populations and where community specific traditional practices are being employed with positive outcomes but are not yet established as best practice.

Information received from surveys is compiled by type of service and for potential application for specific population groups. Determinations about what will need to be done to qualify a practice with positive outcomes as a best or evidence based practice are then be made in partnership with MHOs and agencies that are using the practices.

Results of the identification of existing and promising practices are circulated among MHOs and provider agencies for their potential use and collaboration among potential users of the practices.

OMHAS channels information about potentially available resources to participants in cooperative arrangements and to organizations that demonstrate interest and ability to further develop service capacity to serve racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities and other under-served populations.

Oregon Ethnicity by Percent and Number by County

Legend		0-200	201-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-10,000	10,001-15,000	15,001-25,000	25,001-40,000	40,000 plus			
County	White	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	African American	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Comments						
<i>Baker</i>	95.0%	2.3%	0.6%	1.9%	0.4%	0.1%	15,838	392	104	327	37	18	No significant clusters of Hispanics or Indians, relatively evenly distributed.
<i>Benton</i>	87.0%	4.7%	5.2%	1.6%	1.2%	0.5%	67,816	3,645	4,209	1,298	932	415	Hispanics clustered at middle, western edges, Asians clustered at middle western center; Indians clustered at middle western center; Blacks clustered at middle western center
<i>Clackamas</i>	89.0%	4.9%	3.1%	1.5%	1.0%	0.4%	301,548	16,744	10,921	5,256	3,497	1,348	Hispanics two higher concentrated clusters at north west and mid western borders, with lesser percentages in western and far eastern counties; Asians concentrated in northwest corner with 4 areas of higher concentration; Indians located primarily outside of northwestern and central locations; Blacks at northwest corner with 3 significant areas of concentration
<i>Clatsop</i>	91.0%	4.5%	1.8%	2.1%	0.7%	0.4%	32,364	1,597	649	767	264	137	Hispanics fairly evenly distributed with minor clusters at north central and southeast edges; Asians primarily at northwest corner; Indians only one cluster over 100; Blacks only one cluster over 100
<i>Columbia</i>	93.0%	2.5%	1.0%	2.7%	0.4%	0.2%	40,576	1,093	460	1,224	191	97	Hispanics four tracts from northwest to southeast compose majority; Asians fairly even distributed; Indians similar pattern to Hispanics
<i>Coos</i>	90.0%	3.4%	1.3%	4.5%	50.0%	0.3%	56,616	2,133	844	2,947	350	211	Hispanics primarily clustered at north central; Asians similar pattern to Hispanics; Indians clustered at north central with significant representation elsewhere especially southeast corner; Blacks no significant concentrations

Legend		0-200	201-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-10,000	10,001-15,000	15,001-25,000	25,001-40,000	40,000 plus			
County	White	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	African American	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Comments						
<i>Crook</i>	91.4%	5.6%	0.7%	2.1%	0.1%	0.1%	17,532	1,082	134	405	22	19	Hispanics almost all at northeast corner; Indians most at northeast corner
<i>Curry</i>	91.0%	3.6%	0.9%	4.0%	0.3%	0.2%	19,206	761	196	861	59	42	Hispanics fairly evenly distributed, though weighted at bottom two tracts; Indians weighted middle and bottom tracts
<i>Deschutes</i>	93.0%	3.7%	1.2%	1.8%	0.4%	0.2%	107,177	4,304	1,366	2,067	441	277	Hispanics primarily at central and north central tracts; Asians primarily at central tracts; Indians primarily at south central to north central tracts; Blacks primarily at central tracts with no major clusters; Hawaiian primarily at central tracts no significant concentrations
<i>Douglas</i>	92.0%	3.3%	1.0%	3.3%	0.3%	0.2%	92,302	3,283	1,041	3,368	359	233	Hispanics located from northwest to southeast with larger clusters at central; Asians only one tract at central more than 100; Indians fairly evenly distributed with larger concentrations outside hub; Blacks only one cluster greater than 50
<i>Glliam</i>	96.0%	1.8%	0.3%	1.6%	0.2%	0.0%	1,839	35	5	31	35	0	No significant numbers
<i>Grant</i>	95.0%	2.1%	0.3%	2.7%	0.2%	0.1%	7,506	163	23	217	17	10	Hispanics primarily in southwest half; Indians also primarily in southwest half.
<i>Harney</i>	89.7%	4.2%	0.9%	5.0%	0.2%	0.1%	6,823	316	69	391	17	11	Hispanics 67% at northeast corner; Indians 87% at northeast corner
<i>Hood River</i>	70.7%	25.0%	1.9%	1.7%	0.8%	0.2%	14,426	5,107	398	351	165	52	Hispanics significant population throughout with approximately 40% at northeast corner; Asians most at northeast corner; Indians about 33% at western half with balance at northeastern tracts

Legend							
	0-200	201-500	501-1000	1001-5000			
	5001-10,000	10,001-15,000	15,001-25,000	25,001-40,000	40,000 plus		
County	White	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	African American	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Comments
<i>Jackson</i>	88.7% 160,795	6.7% 12,126	1.4% 2,554	2.3% 4,317	0.7% 1,261	0.4% 686	Hispanics clusters at central region with significant concentration at 3 tracts; Asians clustered in 5 central tracts and 4 south central tracts; Indians clustered at 2 central and 2 north central tracts; Blacks similar patterns to Asians; Hawaiians located at southwest central and south central corridor
<i>Jefferson</i>	65.0% 12,335	17.7% 3,372	0.6% 119	16.9% 3,325	0.5% 91	0.3% 68	Hispanics 20% at southwest 10% at eastern and western tracts 67% concentrated at center; Indians 15% at center most others at northeast
<i>Josephine</i>	91.4% 69,233	4.3% 3,229	1.0% 785	2.8% 2,171	0.4% 342	0.3% 216	Hispanics most at east central with some at southern edge; Asians similar to Hispanics with no significant concentrations; Indians similar to Hispanics; Blacks no significant concentrations; Hawaiians no significant concentration
<i>Klamath</i>	84.0% 53,659	7.8% 4,961	1.2% 820	5.9% 3,885	1.0% 644	0.3% 169	Hispanics most at south central and southern tracts; Asians most at south central tracts; Indians significant clusters at south central with most at one central tract; Blacks no significant clusters
<i>Lake</i>	89.0% 6,617	5.4% 404	0.8% 64	3.9% 294	0.3% 25	0.1% 11	Hispanics 75% at southwestern corner; Indians 66% at southwestern corner
<i>Lane</i>	88.6% 286,075	4.6% 14,874	2.7% 8,984	2.5% 8,503	1.3% 4,199	0.4% 1,328	Hispanics clustered at north to mid central with one high concentration at center; Asians primarily at center with several median and high concentrations; Indians focused at central to south central and northwest to southwest central with clusters in between; Blacks primarily at center with several high concentrations at center

Legend							
	0-200	201-500	501-1000	1001-5000			
	5001-10,000	10,001-15,000	15,001-25,000	25,001-40,000	40,000 plus		
County	White	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	African American	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Comments
<i>Lincoln</i>	83.3% 39,260	4.8% 2,119	1.3% 609	5.1% 2,359	0.6% 278	0.3% 157	Hispanics significant clusters at northwest and west central; Asians similar pattern no major clusters; Indians located at north, south and central regions with 30% at west central; Blacks no cluster greater than 40
<i>Linn</i>	91.2% 94,012	4.4% 4,514	1.2% 1,252	2.6% 2,700	0.5% 551	0.3% 320	Hispanics primarily northwest to north central with distributions northwest to southwest central back to southwest; Asians primarily at west central corner; Indians similar to Hispanics; Blacks no significant concentrations
<i>Malheur</i>	68.8% 21,752	25.6% 8,099	2.4% 773	1.9% 604	1.4% 454	0.2% 56	Hispanics almost all at north with major concentrations at northeastern edge; Asians similar pattern to Hispanics; Indians only one tract over 100; Blacks 75% at northern border
<i>Marion</i>	76.5% 217,880	17.1% 48,714	2.3% 6,707	2.5% 7,502	1.3% 3,717	0.6% 1,640	Hispanics major concentrations at north and northwest plus west central with significant groupings at south central and eastern tracts; Asians almost all at west central with 3 areas of higher concentration; Indians higher percentages at one north central tract several west central, one south center and one far eastern tract; Blacks virtually at west central with clustered higher concentration; Hawaiians most at west central with one north central
<i>Morrow</i>	72.0% 7,911	24.4% 2,686	0.6% 76	2.4% 265	0.3% 37	0.2% 20	Hispanics all but 100 at northern edge; Indians most at northern edge

<i>Legend</i>		0-200	201-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-10,000	10,001-15,000	15,001-25,000	25,001-40,000	40,000 plus			
County	White	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	African American	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Comments						
<i>Multnomah</i>	76.5%	7.5%	6.5%	2.1%	6.5%	0.6%	505,492	49,607	45,012	14,701	44,755	4,419	Hispanics most at northwest and central tracts with high concentrations interspersed at north central, central and mid central tracts; Asians most at western half with high, contiguous concentrations at west central and central to south central tracts; Indians primarily at north central tracts; Blacks primarily at southwest and south central to north central tracts with high concentrations clustered at east central; Hawaiians most at north central then scattered towards central and south central and southwest tracts with significant representation at western half
<i>Polk</i>	85.6%	8.8%	1.5%	3.0%	0.7%	0.4%	56,900	5,480	994	1,955	463	266	Hispanics most at central and eastern edges high cluster at southeast corner; Asians primarily at east central to northeast regions; Indians approximately 33% at western half with many at central to southeast areas; Blacks only one tract with more than 100 at east central; Hawaiians only one tract greater than 75
<i>Sherman</i>	92.1%	4.9%	0.8%	2.2%	0.5%	0.0%	1,782	94	15	43	9	0	No significant numbers of minorities.
<i>Tillamook</i>	91.0%	5.1%	0.9%	2.4%	0.3%	0.4%	22,086	1,244	229	587	85	94	Hispanics approximately 60% at east and west central; Asians only one tract over 60; Indians general representation with one east central larger cluster
<i>Umatilla</i>	77.5%	16.1%	1.0%	4.1%	1.1%	0.3%	54,670	11,366	744	2,993	782	202	Hispanics most at northern border with highest groupings at northwest; Asians no significant concentrations more at northwest; Indians highest density at central tract; Blacks primarily at west to north central locations

County	White	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	African American	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Comments
<i>Union</i>	93.0%	2.4%	1.1%	1.5%	0.7%	0.7%	Hispanics only two tracts over 100; Asians only one tract over 84; Indians no tract 60 or above
	22,843	600	286	384	170	185	
<i>Wallowa</i>	96.0%	1.7%	0.4%	1.7%	0.2%	0.1%	No significant numbers of minorities.
	6,918	125	31	122	12	7	
<i>Wasco</i>	84.0%	9.3%	1.1%	4.6%	0.5%	0.7%	Hispanics most at northwestern corner; Asians similar to with smaller numbers than Hispanics; Indians most at large southern tracts
	19,967	2,214	275	1,123	134	162	
<i>Washington</i>	78.0%	11.2%	7.6%	1.3%	1.6%	0.6%	Hispanics clustered at north to south central trailing to east central with large concentrations at center and east center; Asians distributed in all but north and east central with numerous higher concentrations in contiguous tracts at eastern, central edges; Indians only two larger concentrations towards eastern side; Blacks most at eastern to central and southeast regions; Hawaiians most at east central to southeast with significant clusters at northwest and central
	346,251	49,735	35,197	6,183	7,307	2,876	
<i>Wheeler</i>	92.5%	5.1%	0.4%	2.3%	0.3%	0.2%	No significant numbers of minorities.
	1,431	79	6	36	5	3	
<i>Yamhill</i>	84.3%	10.6%	1.6%	2.4%	1.1%	0.3%	Hispanics significant numbers throughout with highest numbers south central to south and eastern border; Asians mostly at central and south central with some at east central border; Indians representation throughout higher at southwest and central areas; Blacks approximately 40% at central to south central
	71,684	9,017	1,391	2,105	946	264	

Reference "Racial Ethnic Diversity in Oregon . . ." Evans, Stickler, Kelly, OMHAS 2004

**Race/Ethnicity Grouping
Summary Statement
By County and by MHO**

CAUCASIAN (WHITE), NON-HISPANIC

Caucasians are the largest population group in the state and in every county and MHO in the state.

HISPANICS

There are five counties with fewer than 200 Hispanics: Gilliam, Grant, Sherman, Wallowa and Wheeler.

There are six counties with a population of 200 to 1,000: Baker, Harney, Lake, Columbia, Curry and Union.

Fourteen counties have 1,000 to 5,000 people: Benton, Clatsop, Coos, Crook, Deschutes, Douglas, Jefferson, Josephine, Klamath, Lincoln, Linn, Morrow, Tillamook, and Wasco.

Four counties have 5,000 to 10,000 residents, Hood River, Malheur, Polk and Yamhill.

Four counties have 5,000 to 10,000 total Hispanics: Jackson and Umatilla

Two counties range from 15,000 to 25,000: Clackamas and Lane.

No county has a 25,000 to 40,000 Hispanic population

Three counties have populations of 40,000 plus: Marion, Multnomah and Washington.

Asians, non-Hispanic

Twelve counties have 200 or fewer Asians: Baker, Crook, Curry, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Jefferson, Lake, Morrow, Sherman, Wallowa and Wheeler.

Five counties have populations of 200 to 1,000: Columbia, Hood River, Tillamook, Union and Wasco.

Six counties have between 1,000 and 5,000 Asians: Benton, Deschutes, Douglas, Jackson, Linn and Yamhill.

Two counties contain 5,000 to 10,000: Lane and Marion.

Only one county has 10,000 to 15,000: Clackamas.

No counties have between 10,000 and 15,000.

One county has 25,000 to 40,000: Washington.

One county has more than 40,000: Multnomah

American Indians, non-Hispanic

Five counties have 200 or fewer American Indians: Gilliam, Grant, Sherman, Wallowa and Wheeler.

Seven counties have populations of 200 to 1,000: Baker, Crook, Harney, Hood River, Lake, Morrow and Union.

Five counties contain 500 to 1,000 residents: Clatsop, Columbia, Curry, Malheur, and Tillamook.

The most frequently encountered population grouping is the range of 1,000 to 5,000. There are fourteen counties in that range: Benton, Coos, Deschutes, Douglas, Jackson, Jefferson, Josephine, Klamath, Lincoln, Linn, Polk, Umatilla, Wasco, and Yamhill

Four counties have populations of 5,000 to 10,000: Clackamas, Lane, Marion and Washington.

Only one county has a population of greater than 10,000 but fewer than 25,000: Multnomah. There are no reservations in Multnomah County.

African Americans

Sixteen counties have a population base of fewer than 200 people: Baker, Columbia, Crook, Curry, Gilliam, Harney, Hood River, Jefferson, Lake, Morrow, Sherman, Tillamook, Union, Wallowa, Wasco, and Wheeler.

Eight counties have only 200 to 500 African American residents Clatsop, Coos, Deschutes, Douglas, Grant, Josephine, Lincoln and Polk.

Six counties are home to 500 to 1,000 African Americans: Benton, Klamath, Linn, Malheur, Umatilla and Yamhill.

Four counties have population distribution of 1,000 to 5,000: Clackamas, Jackson, Lane, and Marion.

One county, Washington, has a population range of 5,000 to 10,000.

Multnomah County has a population of 40,000 plus, or more than half of the state's population of African Americans.

Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders

This is by far the smallest identified population group, with about two-thirds, or 22, of the state's counties realizing 200 or fewer residents: Baker, Clatsop, Columbia, Crook, Curry, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Hood River, Jefferson, Klamath, Lake, Lincoln, Malheur, Morrow, Sherman, Tillamook, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wasco and Wheeler.

Eight counties have populations of 200 to 500: Benton, Coos, Deschutes, Douglas, Josephine, Linn, Polk and Yamhill.

Only one county, Jackson, has 500 to 1,000 Hawaiians.

Five counties have 1,000 to 5,000 residents, with most in the lower end of the range: Clackamas, Lane, Marion, Multnomah and Washington.

No counties are reported to have greater than 5,000 resident Hawaiians.

Russian, Former Soviet Union Immigrants

No population statistics were readily available for this group of people. There have been significant increases in this sub-population within the last ten to fifteen years in various parts of the state. While this group may have physical characteristics similar to mainstream Americans, their service needs are remarkably different, and current service capacity is highly unlikely to meet them.

Alternate data sources should be contacted in order to gain information about shifting service needs.

Mental Health Organizations

Each of the MHOs has at least one or more significant resident racial/ethnic minority populations. The following is a summary of the populations with the largest presence, by MHO.

Accountable BHA

Hispanics—a group of 1,000 to 5,000 in each of its five member counties

Asians—one county with 500 to 1,000; two with 1,000 to 5,000

American Indians—four counties with 1,000 to 5,000

Clackamas Co. MH

Hispanics—one county each with 1,000 to 5,000; 5,000 to 10,000 and 15,000 to 25,000

Asians—one county with 10,000 to 15,000

American Indians—one county with 1,000 to 5,000; one with 5,000 to 10,000

Family Care

Hispanics—one county with 10,000 to 15,000; two shared counties with 40,000 plus

Asians—one county with 10,000 to 15,000, one shared county with 40,000 plus

Indians—one county with 5,000 to 10,000; one with 10,000 to 25,000

African Americans—one county with 1,000 to 5,000; one with 5,000 to 10,000, one shared county with 40,000 plus

Hawaiians—three counties with 500 to 1,000

Greater Oregon BHI

Hispanics—two counties with 500 to 1,000; two counties with 5,000 to 5,000; 1 county with 5,000 to 10,000; one with 10,000 to 15,000

Asians—three counties with 500 to 1,000

Indians—three counties with 500 to 1,000; one with 1,000 to 5,000

African Americans—two counties with 500 to 1,000

Jefferson Behavioral Health

Hispanics—one county with 500 to 1,000; four counties with 1,000 to 5,000; one county with 10,000 to 15,000; one county with 15,000 to 25,000

Asians—three counties with 500 to 1,000; two counties with 1,000 to 5,000

American Indians—one county with 500 to 1,000; five counties with 1,000 to 5,000

African Americans—one county with 500 to 1,000; one with 1,000 to 5,000

Hawaiians—one county with 500 to 1,000

Lane County/Lane Care

Hispanics—15,000 to 25,000

Asians—5,000 to 10,000

American Indians—5,000 to 10,000

African Americans—1,000 to 5,000

Hawaiians—500 to 1,000

Mid Valley Behavioral Care Network

Hispanics—one county with 1,000 to 5,000; two with 5,000 to 10,000; one with 40,000 plus

Asians—one county with 500 to 1,000; two with 1,000 to 5,000; one with 5,000 to 10,000

American Indians—one county with 500 to 1,000; three with 1,000 to 5,000; one with 5,000 to 10,000

African-Americans—two counties with 500 to 1,000; one with 1,000 to 5,000

Verity

Hispanics—40,000 plus

Asians—40,000 plus

American-Indians—10,000 to 15,000

African-Americans—40,000 plus

Hawaiians—1,000 to 5,000

Washington County

Hispanics—40,000 plus

Asians—25,000 to 40,000

American Indians—5,000 to 10,000

African-Americans—5,000 to 10,000

Hawaiians—1,000 to 5,000

NOTE: Tables for MHO population groupings by age and race/ethnicity are contained in Comparable Access Tables, found in Appendix I and J.

Statewide Summary
 Languages Spoken Other Than English
 By Age Group and Language Groups

Total Spanish Speaking				Total Indo-Euro Speaking Youth			
Youth	Adults	Elders	Total	Youth	Adults	Elders	Total
56,075	154,736	47,682	258,493	15,824	54,895	11,536	82,255

Total Asian-Pacific Island Speaking				Total Other Language Speaking			
Youth	Adults	Elders	Total	Youth	Adults	Elders	Total
13,557	56,216	5,506	75,279	2,180	9,293	1,475	12,948

Total Individuals With Languages Spoken Other Than English	428,975
--	---------

Source: U. S. Census Bureau, SF-4, PT38
 Statewide Summary Languages Spoken Other Than English.xls

Language Ability
 By Age Group By County

	Baker	Benton	Clackamas	Clatsop	Columbia	Coos	Crook	Curry	Deschutes
Total:	15,839	74,282	316,516	33,621	40,734	59,732	17,953	20,269	108,293
5 to 17 years:	3,163	12,823	66,332	6,394	9,052	10,635	3,852	3,150	21,371
Speak only English	3,055	11,673	59,345	5,975	8,672	10,237	3,530	3,031	20,211
Speak Spanish:	86	625	3,455	344	279	348	267	74	870
Speak English "very well"	54	409	2,166	142	141	220	165	54	549
Speak English "well"	28	95	492	162	57	71	66	5	164
Speak English "not well"	4	115	655	40	74	57	36	11	143
Speak English "not at all"	0	6	142	0	7	0	0	4	14
Speak other Indo-European	20	191	2,232	24	76	44	39	27	146
Speak English "very well"	20	166	1,408	14	51	36	39	25	70
Speak English "well"	0	18	463	6	17	8	0	2	21
Speak English "not well"	0	7	333	4	8	0	0	0	55
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	2	263	1,157	44	17	0	0	0	82
Speak English "very well"	0	175	881	22	5	0	0	0	53
Speak English "well"	0	73	230	22	0	0	0	0	21
Speak English "not well"	0	15	46	0	12	0	0	0	8
Speak English "not at all"	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak other languages:	0	71	143	7	8	6	16	18	62
Speak English "very well"	0	26	97	5	3	6	16	3	62
Speak English "well"	0	45	6	0	5	0	0	8	0
Speak English "not well"	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	7	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Douglas	Gilliam	Grant	Harney	Hood River	Jackson	Jefferson	Josephine	Klamath
Total:	94,748	1,828	7,482	7,164	18,932	170,324	17,610	71,725	59,705
5 to 17 years:	18,336	356	1,602	1,525	4,244	33,179	4,239	13,437	12,427
Speak only English	17,555	341	1,550	1,427	2,866	29,989	3,179	12,875	11,227
Speak Spanish:	583	11	44	65	1,316	2,731	884	446	1,062
Speak English "very well"	328	10	22	54	683	1,637	546	325	683
Speak English "well"	99	1	12	11	492	620	180	95	238
Speak English "not well"	147	0	10	0	132	411	109	22	131
Speak English "not at all"	9	0	0	0	9	63	49	4	10
Speak other Indo-European	148	4	7	2	37	332	73	83	47
Speak English "very well"	125	4	7	2	12	197	55	68	45
Speak English "well"	14	0	0	0	16	29	18	6	2
Speak English "not well"	9	0	0	0	9	106	0	9	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	36	0	0	0	25	87	2	29	39
Speak English "very well"	29	0	0	0	16	74	2	29	30
Speak English "well"	5	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Speak English "not well"	2	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	9
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak other languages:	14	0	1	31	0	40	101	4	52
Speak English "very well"	5	0	0	28	0	33	74	4	50
Speak English "well"	0	0	0	3	0	7	27	0	2
Speak English "not well"	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Lake	Lane	Lincoln	Linn	Malheur	Marion	Morrow	Multnomah	Polk
Total:	7,042	304,463	42,327	96,024	29,285	262,794	10,058	618,617	58,294
5 to 17 years:	1,451	55,098	7,367	19,703	6,344	55,826	2,440	105,138	11,733
Speak only English	1,376	50,404	6,922	18,439	4,579	42,499	1,644	83,329	10,444
Speak Spanish:	62	3,150	378	844	1,701	10,409	790	8,593	1,041
Speak English "very well"	40	2,119	161	558	1,253	5,793	443	4,672	421
Speak English "well"	1	572	78	157	300	2,503	168	1,890	352
Speak English "not well"	21	420	127	120	132	1,509	148	1,671	215
Speak English "not at all"	0	39	12	9	16	604	31	360	53
Speak other Indo-European	13	719	40	300	15	1,993	3	6,690	125
Speak English "very well"	0	498	27	216	11	1,134	3	3,600	93
Speak English "well"	3	137	7	42	4	640	0	1,971	24
Speak English "not well"	6	84	6	36	0	194	0	838	1
Speak English "not at all"	4	0	0	6	0	25	0	281	7
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	0	694	23	117	48	803	2	5,724	89
Speak English "very well"	0	460	5	116	26	516	2	3,101	41
Speak English "well"	0	141	11	1	7	177	0	1,793	48
Speak English "not well"	0	93	7	0	15	98	0	761	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	69	0
Speak other languages:	0	131	4	3	1	122	1	802	34
Speak English "very well"	0	108	4	3	1	85	1	618	14
Speak English "well"	0	10	0	0	0	18	0	140	12
Speak English "not well"	0	13	0	0	0	8	0	37	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	7	8

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Sherman	Tillamook	Umatilla	Union	Wallowa	Wasco	Washington	Wheeler	Yamhill
Total:	1,835	23,033	65,317	23,009	6,874	22,260	410,641	1,480	79,213
5 to 17 years:	409	4,154	14,349	4,525	1,391	4,463	84,537	286	16,863
Speak only English	351	3,855	11,101	4,345	1,367	3,874	68,293	274	14,724
Speak Spanish:	49	274	3,026	116	11	520	9,684	10	1,927
Speak English "very well"	25	175	1,890	78	5	287	5,607	2	1,185
Speak English "well"	19	53	740	20	1	107	2,069	0	370
Speak English "not well"	5	27	317	16	5	115	1,501	8	282
Speak English "not at all"	0	19	79	2	0	11	507	0	90
Speak other Indo-European	1	24	53	25	10	32	2,151	2	96
Speak English "very well"	0	22	45	25	5	26	1,753	0	78
Speak English "well"	1	2	8	0	0	6	291	0	7
Speak English "not well"	0	0	0	0	5	0	107	2	11
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	8	0	94	31	0	0	4,046	0	95
Speak English "very well"	8	0	66	15	0	0	2,776	0	69
Speak English "well"	0	0	20	0	0	0	791	0	16
Speak English "not well"	0	0	8	16	0	0	456	0	10
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	0
Speak other languages:	0	1	75	8	3	37	363	0	21
Speak English "very well"	0	1	67	8	3	29	308	0	21
Speak English "well"	0	0	8	0	0	8	42	0	0
Speak English "not well"	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Baker	Benton	Clackamas	Clatsop	Columbia	Coos	Crook	Curry	Deschutes
Total:	15,839	74,282	316,516	33,621	40,734	59,732	17,953	20,269	108,293
18 to 64 years:	9,466	53,507	212,661	21,721	26,590	37,124	11,315	11,430	71,888
Speak only English	9,022	47,674	191,330	19,988	25,642	35,144	10,569	10,823	67,869
Speak Spanish:	284	2,308	9,999	1,128	476	1,061	625	350	2,551
Speak English "very well"	155	1,209	4,751	490	267	698	250	269	1,320
Speak English "well"	41	349	1,743	220	91	171	147	56	589
Speak English "not well"	71	559	2,498	329	91	127	153	25	563
Speak English "not at all"	17	191	1,007	89	27	65	75	0	79
Speak other Indo-European	113	1,338	6,385	230	288	632	67	165	985
Speak English "very well"	78	1,050	4,221	185	252	537	60	147	824
Speak English "well"	15	216	1,259	32	26	53	0	8	106
Speak English "not well"	20	66	716	13	10	42	7	2	55
Speak English "not at all"	0	6	189	0	0	0	0	8	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	41	1,901	4,088	219	120	184	18	67	366
Speak English "very well"	7	957	2,123	103	75	95	13	49	242
Speak English "well"	17	661	1,351	75	41	32	5	18	73
Speak English "not well"	0	272	568	41	4	43	0	0	51
Speak English "not at all"	17	11	46	0	0	14	0	0	0
Speak other languages:	6	286	859	156	64	103	36	25	117
Speak English "very well"	6	207	576	116	46	71	36	25	105
Speak English "well"	0	73	223	40	18	17	0	0	12
Speak English "not well"	0	6	60	0	0	15	0	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Douglas	Gilliam	Grant	Harney	Hood River	Jackson	Jefferson	Josephine	Klamath
Total:	94,748	1,828	7,482	7,164	18,932	170,324	17,610	71,725	59,705
18 to 64 years:	58,544	1,108	4,554	4,513	12,068	108,146	11,009	43,049	37,804
Speak only English	56,255	1,072	4,433	4,225	8,946	99,318	8,862	40,883	34,577
Speak Spanish:	1,318	21	89	142	2,878	6,475	1,749	1,357	2,399
Speak English "very well"	880	9	53	81	814	3,325	628	842	1,041
Speak English "well"	268	9	31	29	742	1,382	370	286	497
Speak English "not well"	135	3	5	17	888	1,088	462	173	532
Speak English "not at all"	35	0	0	15	434	680	289	56	329
Speak other Indo-European	503	9	13	38	139	1,342	151	560	464
Speak English "very well"	451	7	13	28	122	1,059	109	479	386
Speak English "well"	28	0	0	10	17	183	15	47	64
Speak English "not well"	21	2	0	0	0	100	18	34	14
Speak English "not at all"	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	339	4	4	28	99	790	34	150	196
Speak English "very well"	222	2	4	16	49	457	8	87	131
Speak English "well"	82	2	0	12	25	219	19	26	44
Speak English "not well"	35	0	0	0	25	91	7	34	21
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	3	0
Speak other languages:	129	2	15	80	6	221	213	99	168
Speak English "very well"	119	2	9	73	0	184	194	85	143
Speak English "well"	8	0	4	7	6	28	19	6	20
Speak English "not well"	2	0	2	0	0	9	0	8	5
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Lake	Lane	Lincoln	Linn	Malheur	Marion	Morrow	Multnomah	Polk
Total:	7,042	304,463	42,327	96,024	29,285	262,794	10,058	618,617	58,294
18 to 64 years:	4,277	206,411	26,346	61,443	18,648	171,751	6,460	439,651	37,381
Speak only English	4,031	189,056	24,620	57,561	14,649	136,109	4,971	365,856	33,407
Speak Spanish:	188	8,785	1,153	2,594	3,708	27,364	1,390	29,005	3,023
Speak English "very well"	51	4,841	453	1,126	1,950	9,279	415	11,671	1,313
Speak English "well"	39	1,594	209	563	699	4,901	299	5,911	369
Speak English "not well"	64	1,855	405	590	571	7,643	420	7,765	604
Speak English "not at all"	34	495	86	315	488	5,541	256	3,658	737
Speak other Indo-European	38	4,088	359	776	184	4,576	37	19,233	509
Speak English "very well"	22	3,318	314	609	124	2,620	35	10,759	415
Speak English "well"	5	519	23	126	48	997	2	3,979	40
Speak English "not well"	11	244	22	41	12	777	0	3,775	50
Speak English "not at all"	0	7	0	0	0	182	0	720	4
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	20	3,925	155	407	70	3,128	48	22,225	381
Speak English "very well"	13	1,952	73	210	43	1,312	30	8,408	199
Speak English "well"	3	1,336	58	111	19	1,006	6	7,263	135
Speak English "not well"	4	614	24	74	4	710	7	5,583	25
Speak English "not at all"	0	23	0	12	4	100	5	971	22
Speak other languages:	0	557	59	105	37	574	14	3,332	61
Speak English "very well"	0	425	41	73	30	329	11	1,958	48
Speak English "well"	0	89	18	16	2	78	1	806	8
Speak English "not well"	0	43	0	8	5	109	2	438	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	8	0	58	0	130	5

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Sherman	Tillamook	Umatilla	Union	Wallowa	Wasco	Washington	Wheeler	Yamhill
Total:	1,835	23,033	65,317	23,009	6,874	22,260	410,641	1,480	79,213
18 to 64 years:	1,076	14,123	42,354	14,851	4,111	13,828	286,794	838	52,402
Speak only English	996	13,134	35,422	14,061	3,986	12,224	230,498	796	46,093
Speak Spanish:	59	724	5,996	492	59	1,264	28,603	38	5,081
Speak English "very well"	36	302	2,557	302	37	510	10,341	24	1,958
Speak English "well"	17	100	1,132	75	13	323	5,608	4	970
Speak English "not well"	6	228	1,390	110	7	319	8,131	7	1,381
Speak English "not at all"	0	94	917	5	2	112	4,523	3	772
Speak other Indo-European	15	169	368	144	52	165	10,018	4	738
Speak English "very well"	9	128	298	124	46	142	7,274	0	589
Speak English "well"	0	20	45	16	6	13	1,925	0	112
Speak English "not well"	6	16	16	4	0	10	772	4	28
Speak English "not at all"	0	5	9	0	0	0	47	0	9
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	3	65	397	145	8	81	16,119	0	391
Speak English "very well"	3	59	184	63	6	18	7,935	0	180
Speak English "well"	0	0	115	50	0	34	5,217	0	117
Speak English "not well"	0	6	77	32	2	29	2,607	0	66
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	21	0	0	0	360	0	28
Speak other languages:	3	31	171	9	6	94	1,556	0	99
Speak English "very well"	3	31	134	6	4	81	1,103	0	63
Speak English "well"	0	0	33	0	2	13	308	0	14
Speak English "not well"	0	0	0	3	0	0	115	0	22
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	4	0	0	0	30	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Baker	Benton	Clackamas	Clatsop	Columbia	Coos	Crook	Curry	Deschutes
Total:	15,839	74,282	316,516	33,621	40,734	59,732	17,953	20,269	108,293
65 years and over:	3,210	7,952	37,523	5,506	5,092	11,973	2,786	5,689	15,034
Speak only English	3,133	7,528	35,535	5,263	4,845	11,662	2,730	5,323	14,407
Speak Spanish:	63	94	399	32	33	110	21	80	161
Speak English "very well"	30	44	259	23	26	78	16	72	139
Speak English "well"	25	10	99	1	2	23	0	0	22
Speak English "not well"	8	15	30	4	1	9	5	8	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	25	11	4	4	0	0	0	0
Speak other Indo-European	14	200	1,103	95	127	166	11	240	401
Speak English "very well"	12	136	657	84	113	133	11	177	352
Speak English "well"	2	47	197	5	12	28	0	39	31
Speak English "not well"	0	17	122	6	0	5	0	24	18
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	127	0	2	0	0	0	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	0	120	390	47	11	23	9	16	52
Speak English "very well"	0	42	100	33	3	16	0	14	14
Speak English "well"	0	23	137	2	5	7	9	2	22
Speak English "not well"	0	21	93	2	3	0	0	0	12
Speak English "not at all"	0	34	60	10	0	0	0	0	4
Speak other languages:	0	10	96	69	76	12	15	30	13
Speak English "very well"	0	4	57	56	60	12	15	30	13
Speak English "well"	0	6	39	13	15	0	0	0	0
Speak English "not well"	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Douglas	Gilliam	Grant	Harney	Hood River	Jackson	Jefferson	Josephine	Klamath
Total:	94,748	1,828	7,482	7,164	18,932	170,324	17,610	71,725	59,705
65 years and over:	17,868	364	1,326	1,126	2,620	28,999	2,362	15,239	9,474
Speak only English	17,227	357	1,288	1,083	2,442	27,929	2,215	14,542	9,037
Speak Spanish:	204	3	11	0	79	368	56	217	153
Speak English "very well"	142	3	6	0	31	206	38	159	81
Speak English "well"	34	0	2	0	14	57	5	43	38
Speak English "not well"	28	0	3	0	11	60	3	13	11
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	23	45	10	2	23
Speak other Indo-European	361	4	27	24	43	575	18	399	213
Speak English "very well"	289	4	23	22	26	403	10	293	185
Speak English "well"	72	0	4	2	11	110	6	57	16
Speak English "not well"	0	0	0	0	2	55	2	46	12
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	3	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	30	0	0	0	49	95	19	30	43
Speak English "very well"	13	0	0	0	11	35	1	12	24
Speak English "well"	7	0	0	0	27	32	6	0	8
Speak English "not well"	8	0	0	0	11	28	12	18	5
Speak English "not at all"	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Speak other languages:	46	0	0	19	7	32	54	51	28
Speak English "very well"	10	0	0	14	7	32	43	41	28
Speak English "well"	24	0	0	5	0	0	4	0	0
Speak English "not well"	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Lake	Lane	Lincoln	Linn	Malheur	Marion	Morrow	Multnomah	Polk
Total:	7,042	304,463	42,327	96,024	29,285	262,794	10,058	618,617	58,294
65 years and over:	1,314	42,954	8,614	14,878	4,293	35,217	1,158	73,828	9,180
Speak only English	1,296	41,102	8,365	14,402	3,876	32,846	1,095	66,550	8,629
Speak Spanish:	6	472	69	122	231	1,068	45	1,169	100
Speak English "very well"	0	349	39	83	75	454	27	738	67
Speak English "well"	0	50	0	20	76	219	2	147	14
Speak English "not well"	6	54	20	15	64	187	4	187	6
Speak English "not at all"	0	19	10	4	16	208	12	97	13
Speak other Indo-European	5	1,045	136	274	35	949	13	3,425	380
Speak English "very well"	5	777	103	192	18	586	8	1,644	243
Speak English "well"	0	215	27	68	12	148	5	592	99
Speak English "not well"	0	45	6	14	5	109	0	539	29
Speak English "not at all"	0	8	0	0	0	106	0	650	9
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	7	216	20	78	102	272	5	2,361	57
Speak English "very well"	4	120	7	23	25	72	2	526	22
Speak English "well"	3	24	9	27	40	60	0	456	0
Speak English "not well"	0	65	4	17	31	60	3	724	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	7	0	11	6	80	0	655	35
Speak other languages:	0	119	24	2	49	82	0	323	14
Speak English "very well"	0	81	15	0	48	63	0	182	8
Speak English "well"	0	24	9	0	1	19	0	76	0
Speak English "not well"	0	14	0	2	0	0	0	54	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

	Sherman	Tillamook	Umatilla	Union	Wallowa	Wasco	Washington	Wheeler	Yamhill
Total:	1,835	23,033	65,317	23,009	6,874	22,260	410,641	1,480	79,213
65 years and over:	350	4,756	8,614	3,633	1,372	3,969	39,310	356	9,948
Speak only English	342	4,594	8,192	3,576	1,351	3,830	35,504	348	9,550
Speak Spanish:	6	32	223	2	13	71	887	4	199
Speak English "very well"	6	28	72	0	6	50	438	4	118
Speak English "well"	0	2	71	2	0	0	102	0	6
Speak English "not well"	0	2	11	0	7	19	185	0	39
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	69	0	0	2	162	0	36
Speak other Indo-European	2	98	132	31	6	42	1,365	4	146
Speak English "very well"	2	57	115	29	4	30	764	4	106
Speak English "well"	0	38	6	2	2	0	318	0	29
Speak English "not well"	0	3	7	0	0	12	210	0	11
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	4	0	0	0	73	0	0
Speak Asian/ Pac. Island	0	16	35	20	0	6	1,333	0	44
Speak English "very well"	0	13	18	10	0	0	289	0	13
Speak English "well"	0	1	0	2	0	5	283	0	31
Speak English "not well"	0	2	3	8	0	1	404	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	14	0	0	0	357	0	0
Speak other languages:	0	16	32	4	2	20	221	0	9
Speak English "very well"	0	14	30	4	2	12	110	0	5
Speak English "well"	0	2	2	0	0	8	52	0	4
Speak English "not well"	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0

NOTE: "Total" is county population. Age groupings (5 to 17, 18 to 64 and 65 Plus) are county population of that age. Sum of Language spoken, by language will be greater than Age Group total.

Reference U. S. Census Bureau Table SF 4, PT 38

Oregon by County, Total Population by Age and by Language Categories

Oregon Language Ability by Age Group by County

Oregon Language Spoken By Age Group by MHO

	% of MHO Accountable Age Group		% of MHO Clackamas Co Age Group		% of MHO Family Care Inc Age Group	
Total:	260,465		361,371		1,345,774	
5 to 17 years:	49,652		75,804		256,007	
Speak only English	45,515	91.67%	66,777	88.09%	210,967	82.41%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	3,024	6.09%	5,351	7.06%	21,732	8.49%
French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	186	0.37%	347	0.46%	1,214	0.47%
French Creole	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	131	0.05%
Italian	7	0.01%	40	0.05%	116	0.05%
Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	10	0.02%	15	0.02%	73	0.03%
German	169	0.34%	297	0.39%	964	0.38%
Yiddish	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other West Germanic languages	11	0.02%	48	0.06%	173	0.07%
Scandinavian languages	17	0.03%	84	0.11%	165	0.06%
Greek	19	0.04%	24	0.03%	82	0.03%
Russian	31	0.06%	855	1.13%	3,707	1.45%
Polish	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	84	0.03%
Serbo-Croatian	0	0.00%	7	0.01%	248	0.10%
Other Slavic languages	23	0.05%	273	0.36%	1,444	0.56%
Armenian	0	0.00%	7	0.01%	56	0.02%
Persian	0	0.00%	100	0.13%	424	0.17%
Gujarathi	5	0.01%	47	0.06%	95	0.04%
Hindi	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	296	0.12%
Urdu	5	0.01%	7	0.01%	188	0.07%
Other Indic languages	0	0.00%	35	0.05%	248	0.10%
Other Indo-European languages	6	0.01%	120	0.16%	1,365	0.53%
Chinese	119	0.24%	253	0.33%	2,016	0.79%
Japanese	45	0.09%	205	0.27%	1,101	0.43%
Korean	86	0.17%	346	0.46%	1,391	0.54%
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	0	0.00%	40	0.05%	545	0.21%
Miao, Hmong	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	519	0.20%
Thai	26	0.05%	0	0.00%	99	0.04%
Laotian	0	0.00%	34	0.04%	515	0.20%
Vietnamese	29	0.06%	258	0.34%	3,117	1.22%
Other Asian languages	0	0.00%	12	0.02%	685	0.27%
Tagalog	25	0.05%	42	0.06%	562	0.22%
Other Pacific Island languages	40	0.08%	0	0.00%	377	0.15%
Navajo	16	0.03%	7	0.01%	15	0.01%
Other Native North American languages	118	0.24%	49	0.06%	50	0.02%
Hungarian	6	0.01%	0	0.00%	60	0.02%
Arabic	47	0.09%	44	0.06%	468	0.18%
Hebrew	9	0.02%	35	0.05%	172	0.07%
African languages	27	0.05%	34	0.04%	463	0.18%
Other and unspecified languages	31	0.06%	11	0.01%	80	0.03%

Oregon Language Spoken By Age Group by MHO

	Greater Oregon BHC	% of MHO Age Group	Jefferson BH	% of MHO Age Group	Mid-Valley BCN	% of MHO Age Group
Total:	530,800		476,503		519,358	
5 to 17 years:	112,460		91,164		108,279	
Speak only English	98,735	87.80%	84,914	93.14%	89,961	83.08%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	9,645	8.58%	5,244	5.75%	14,495	13.39%
French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	431	0.38%	206	0.23%	193	0.18%
French Creole	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Italian	51	0.05%	16	0.02%	50	0.05%
Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	15	0.01%	20	0.02%	27	0.02%
German	326	0.29%	267	0.29%	340	0.31%
Yiddish	0	0.00%	11	0.01%	0	0.00%
Other West Germanic languages	49	0.04%	6	0.01%	25	0.02%
Scandinavian languages	91	0.08%	8	0.01%	20	0.02%
Greek	27	0.02%	16	0.02%	7	0.01%
Russian	870	0.77%	59	0.06%	1,426	1.32%
Polish	0	0.00%	10	0.01%	21	0.02%
Serbo-Croatian	9	0.01%	0	0.00%	7	0.01%
Other Slavic languages	272	0.24%	3	0.00%	307	0.28%
Armenian	7	0.01%	22	0.02%	0	0.00%
Persian	100	0.09%	0	0.00%	26	0.02%
Gujarathi	45	0.04%	18	0.02%	53	0.05%
Hindi	0	0.00%	17	0.02%	0	0.00%
Urdu	7	0.01%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Indic languages	38	0.03%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Indo-European languages	120	0.11%	2	0.00%	36	0.03%
Chinese	303	0.27%	21	0.02%	242	0.22%
Japanese	243	0.22%	31	0.03%	150	0.14%
Korean	346	0.31%	25	0.03%	118	0.11%
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	40	0.04%	0	0.00%	62	0.06%
Miao, Hmong	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	103	0.10%
Thai	0	0.00%	19	0.02%	18	0.02%
Laotian	64	0.06%	0	0.00%	32	0.03%
Vietnamese	264	0.23%	22	0.02%	175	0.16%
Other Asian languages	21	0.02%	17	0.02%	9	0.01%
Tagalog	51	0.05%	49	0.05%	66	0.06%
Other Pacific Island languages	19	0.02%	7	0.01%	129	0.12%
Navajo	6	0.01%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Native North American languages	103	0.09%	76	0.08%	23	0.02%
Hungarian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18	0.02%
Arabic	63	0.06%	0	0.00%	18	0.02%
Hebrew	35	0.03%	31	0.03%	7	0.01%
African languages	34	0.03%	14	0.02%	59	0.05%
Other and unspecified languages	30	0.03%	13	0.01%	56	0.05%

Oregon Language Spoken By Age Group by MHO

	Lane Valley dba LaneCare	% of MHO Age Group	Verity Integrated BH	% of MHO Age Group	Washington Co. Dept of H&HS	% of MHO Age Group
Total:	304,463		618,617		410,641	
5 to 17 years:	55,098		105,138		84,537	
Speak only English	50,404	91.48%	83,329	79.26%	68,293	80.78%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	3,150	5.72%	8,593	8.17%	9,684	11.46%
French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	294	0.53%	476	0.45%	419	0.50%
French Creole	0	0.00%	113	0.11%	18	0.02%
Italian	10	0.02%	65	0.06%	11	0.01%
Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	0	0.00%	16	0.02%	42	0.05%
German	170	0.31%	388	0.37%	309	0.37%
Yiddish	8	0.01%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other West Germanic languages	0	0.00%	63	0.06%	64	0.08%
Scandinavian languages	19	0.03%	32	0.03%	49	0.06%
Greek	10	0.02%	35	0.03%	23	0.03%
Russian	101	0.18%	2,672	2.54%	180	0.21%
Polish	0	0.00%	31	0.03%	53	0.06%
Serbo-Croatian	0	0.00%	205	0.19%	36	0.04%
Other Slavic languages	22	0.04%	1,058	1.01%	116	0.14%
Armenian	0	0.00%	21	0.02%	28	0.03%
Persian	0	0.00%	95	0.09%	229	0.27%
Gujarathi	31	0.06%	19	0.02%	31	0.04%
Hindi	31	0.06%	144	0.14%	152	0.18%
Urdu	0	0.00%	23	0.02%	158	0.19%
Other Indic languages	14	0.03%	151	0.14%	71	0.08%
Other Indo-European languages	9	0.02%	1,083	1.03%	162	0.19%
Chinese	156	0.28%	967	0.92%	805	0.95%
Japanese	209	0.38%	449	0.43%	467	0.55%
Korean	161	0.29%	209	0.20%	840	0.99%
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	30	0.05%	297	0.28%	208	0.25%
Miao, Hmong	0	0.00%	507	0.48%	12	0.01%
Thai	14	0.03%	61	0.06%	38	0.04%
Laotian	6	0.01%	405	0.39%	76	0.09%
Vietnamese	30	0.05%	1,885	1.79%	974	1.15%
Other Asian languages	4	0.01%	390	0.37%	283	0.33%
Tagalog	30	0.05%	266	0.25%	254	0.30%
Other Pacific Island languages	54	0.10%	288	0.27%	89	0.11%
Navajo	16	0.03%	15	0.01%	0	0.00%
Other Native North American languages	43	0.08%	31	0.03%	0	0.00%
Hungarian	0	0.00%	44	0.04%	16	0.02%
Arabic	54	0.10%	151	0.14%	273	0.32%
Hebrew	0	0.00%	85	0.08%	52	0.06%
African languages	18	0.03%	407	0.39%	22	0.03%
Other and unspecified languages	0	0.00%	69	0.07%	0	0.00%

Oregon Language Spoken By Age Group by MHO

	% of MHO Age Group Accountable		% of MHO Age Group Clackamas Co		% of MHO Age Group Family Care Inc	
18 years and over:	210,813		285,567		1,089,767	
Speak only English	194,839	92.42%	257,074	90.02%	925,273	84.91%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	8,787	4.17%	14,779	19.50%	70,062	6.43%
French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	800	0.38%	1,022	1.35%	4,925	0.45%
French Creole	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	143	0.01%
Italian	218	0.10%	315	0.42%	1,591	0.15%
Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	91	0.04%	73	0.10%	450	0.04%
German	1,171	0.56%	2,202	2.90%	7,844	0.72%
Yiddish	39	0.02%	0	0.00%	44	0.00%
Other West Germanic languages	195	0.09%	323	0.43%	1,306	0.12%
Scandinavian languages	294	0.14%	313	0.41%	1,447	0.13%
Greek	53	0.03%	64	0.08%	753	0.07%
Russian	182	0.09%	1,484	1.96%	7,737	0.71%
Polish	45	0.02%	109	0.14%	768	0.07%
Serbo-Croatian	39	0.02%	129	0.17%	1,014	0.09%
Other Slavic languages	86	0.04%	525	0.69%	2,816	0.26%
Armenian	13	0.01%	8	0.01%	188	0.02%
Persian	48	0.02%	410	0.54%	1,977	0.18%
Gujarathi	43	0.02%	111	0.15%	440	0.04%
Hindi	113	0.05%	72	0.09%	1,967	0.18%
Urdu	31	0.01%	77	0.10%	451	0.04%
Other Indic languages	119	0.06%	194	0.26%	1,597	0.15%
Other Indo-European languages	86	0.04%	476	0.63%	4,071	0.37%
Chinese	891	0.42%	1,226	1.62%	9,362	0.86%
Japanese	434	0.21%	678	0.89%	4,533	0.42%
Korean	463	0.22%	1,031	1.36%	5,293	0.49%
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	28	0.01%	72	0.09%	1,728	0.16%
Miao, Hmong	0	0.00%	31	0.04%	834	0.08%
Thai	168	0.08%	71	0.09%	793	0.07%
Laotian	29	0.01%	147	0.19%	2,009	0.18%
Vietnamese	85	0.04%	649	0.86%	13,082	1.20%
Other Asian languages	150	0.07%	161	0.21%	2,997	0.28%
Tagalog	175	0.08%	488	0.64%	3,895	0.36%
Other Pacific Island languages	271	0.13%	166	0.22%	1,990	0.18%
Navajo	21	0.01%	15	0.02%	69	0.01%
Other Native North American languages	325	0.15%	107	0.14%	243	0.02%
Hungarian	40	0.02%	87	0.11%	448	0.04%
Arabic	210	0.10%	556	0.73%	2,417	0.22%
Hebrew	52	0.02%	51	0.07%	331	0.03%
African languages	64	0.03%	93	0.12%	1,849	0.17%
Other and unspecified languages	115	0.05%	178	0.23%	1,030	0.09%

Oregon Language Spoken By Age Group by MHO

	Greater Oregon BHC	% of MHO Age Group	Jefferson BH	% of MHO Age Group	Mid-Valley BCN	% of MHO Age Group
18 years and over:	418,340		385,339		411,079	
Speak only English	378,186	90.40%	362,720	94.13%	356,325	86.68%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	23,891	5.71%	14,092	3.66%	40,307	9.81%
French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	1,234	0.29%	1,303	0.34%	876	0.21%
French Creole	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	12	0.00%
Italian	402	0.10%	418	0.11%	295	0.07%
Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	90	0.02%	171	0.04%	178	0.04%
German	2,714	0.65%	2,095	0.54%	2,602	0.63%
Yiddish	0	0.00%	30	0.01%	0	0.00%
Other West Germanic languages	376	0.09%	426	0.11%	399	0.10%
Scandinavian languages	473	0.11%	336	0.09%	390	0.09%
Greek	79	0.02%	70	0.02%	80	0.02%
Russian	1,531	0.37%	228	0.06%	2,549	0.62%
Polish	129	0.03%	113	0.03%	118	0.03%
Serbo-Croatian	134	0.03%	56	0.01%	46	0.01%
Other Slavic languages	585	0.14%	129	0.03%	436	0.11%
Armenian	8	0.00%	26	0.01%	31	0.01%
Persian	414	0.10%	30	0.01%	100	0.02%
Gujarathi	121	0.03%	47	0.01%	107	0.03%
Hindi	100	0.02%	50	0.01%	65	0.02%
Urdu	102	0.02%	7	0.00%	28	0.01%
Other Indic languages	187	0.04%	36	0.01%	95	0.02%
Other Indo-European languages	506	0.12%	49	0.01%	208	0.05%
Chinese	1,379	0.33%	298	0.08%	930	0.23%
Japanese	881	0.21%	547	0.14%	829	0.20%
Korean	1,030	0.25%	224	0.06%	619	0.15%
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	91	0.02%	28	0.01%	304	0.07%
Miao, Hmong	31	0.01%	0	0.00%	110	0.03%
Thai	105	0.03%	73	0.02%	73	0.02%
Laotian	210	0.05%	9	0.00%	132	0.03%
Vietnamese	708	0.17%	161	0.04%	723	0.18%
Other Asian languages	149	0.04%	29	0.01%	80	0.02%
Tagalog	595	0.14%	387	0.10%	489	0.12%
Other Pacific Island languages	360	0.09%	207	0.05%	550	0.13%
Navajo	33	0.01%	14	0.00%	28	0.01%
Other Native North American languages	246	0.06%	332	0.09%	170	0.04%
Hungarian	91	0.02%	111	0.03%	122	0.03%
Arabic	583	0.14%	77	0.02%	180	0.04%
Hebrew	57	0.01%	144	0.04%	29	0.01%
African languages	100	0.02%	83	0.02%	137	0.03%
Other and unspecified languages	429	0.10%	183	0.05%	327	0.08%

Oregon Language Spoken By Age Group by MHO

	Lane Valley dba LaneCare	% of MHO Age Group	Verity Integrated BH	% of MHO Age Group	Washington Co. Dept of H&HS	% of MHO Age Group
18 years and over:	249,365		513,479		326,104	
Speak only English	230,158	92.30%	432,406	84.21%	266,002	81.57%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	9,257	3.71%	30,174	5.88%	29,490	9.04%
French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	1,218	0.49%	2,801	0.55%	1,198	0.37%
French Creole	0	0.00%	129	0.03%	14	0.00%
Italian	280	0.11%	914	0.18%	362	0.11%
Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	86	0.03%	267	0.05%	116	0.04%
German	1,660	0.67%	3,559	0.69%	2,274	0.70%
Yiddish	21	0.01%	38	0.01%	6	0.00%
Other West Germanic languages	325	0.13%	571	0.11%	427	0.13%
Scandinavian languages	321	0.13%	718	0.14%	429	0.13%
Greek	68	0.03%	533	0.10%	162	0.05%
Russian	236	0.09%	5,222	1.02%	1,044	0.32%
Polish	50	0.02%	436	0.08%	223	0.07%
Serbo-Croatian	43	0.02%	692	0.13%	197	0.06%
Other Slavic languages	233	0.09%	1,808	0.35%	507	0.16%
Armenian	0	0.00%	121	0.02%	59	0.02%
Persian	113	0.05%	533	0.10%	1,034	0.32%
Gujarathi	106	0.04%	196	0.04%	138	0.04%
Hindi	146	0.06%	754	0.15%	1,156	0.35%
Urdu	12	0.00%	127	0.02%	247	0.08%
Other Indic languages	141	0.06%	516	0.10%	916	0.28%
Other Indo-European languages	74	0.03%	2,723	0.53%	874	0.27%
Chinese	1,024	0.41%	4,746	0.92%	3,450	1.06%
Japanese	1,033	0.41%	2,319	0.45%	1,605	0.49%
Korean	741	0.30%	1,477	0.29%	2,810	0.86%
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	73	0.03%	807	0.16%	856	0.26%
Miao, Hmong	0	0.00%	787	0.15%	16	0.00%
Thai	199	0.08%	385	0.07%	337	0.10%
Laotian	42	0.02%	1,379	0.27%	483	0.15%
Vietnamese	240	0.10%	8,643	1.68%	3,828	1.17%
Other Asian languages	84	0.03%	979	0.19%	1,869	0.57%
Tagalog	284	0.11%	1,801	0.35%	1,631	0.50%
Other Pacific Island languages	421	0.17%	1,263	0.25%	567	0.17%
Navajo	0	0.00%	63	0.01%	0	0.00%
Other Native North American languages	118	0.05%	148	0.03%	82	0.03%
Hungarian	103	0.04%	256	0.05%	105	0.03%
Arabic	206	0.08%	900	0.18%	961	0.29%
Hebrew	74	0.03%	217	0.04%	63	0.02%
African languages	112	0.04%	1,486	0.29%	276	0.08%
Other and unspecified languages	63	0.03%	585	0.11%	290	0.09%

Source: Oregon Language Spoken by Age Group by MHO

Comparable Access Ratio Tables

The following tables present information about the number of people who received services by sub-groups in comparison to their presence in the general population. The comparison of the percent of a sub-group in mental health service compared to the same sub-group in the general population is referred to here as Comparable Access (CA) Ratios.

Additional information about methods used to construct the ratios is provided in the section of this report entitled Service Statistics, beginning on page 17.

The DHS Office of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OMHAS) provided service statistics for crisis, outpatient and inpatient services from multiple sources.

All service data is from calendar year 2003. Census data used in calculations was provided by OMHAS from Oregon sources.

The Client Processing and Monitoring System (CPMS) was the source of data for Crisis services and Outpatient services.

The Oregon Patient Resident Care System (OPRCS) served as the source of data for acute psychiatric community based hospital care and for state hospital long term inpatient care.

Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) information was provided for outpatient and community inpatient services. That data is not included in this report purposely.

CPMS and OPRCS data appear to be a source of a broader range of data than MMIS, which is limited to only those individuals whose care was supported by Medicaid. Use of the broader range of data is intended to give a more inclusive view of all recipients of care.

Use of MMIS data may be considered for future data reviews. Consideration may also be given to substituting another population comparison source. Use of data for people at or below 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL) may be a more desirable indicator of people served by the public mental health system.

**Statewide Comparable Access Ratios
 Outpatient, Crisis, and Inpatient
 By Racial/Ethnic Group and by Age**

Statewide -- Client Processing and Monitoring System -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	19,734	26.61%	686,301	20.88%	1.27	37,674	50.80%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.13
Hispanic	2,742	3.70%	107,775	3.28%	1.13	2,017	2.72%	161,577	4.92%	0.55
Asian	276	0.37%	24,712	0.75%	0.50	1,159	1.56%	58,993	1.79%	0.87
Native American	909	1.23%	14,480	0.44%	2.78	1,069	1.44%	23,870	0.73%	1.99
African American	1,770	2.39%	17,437	0.53%	4.50	1,841	2.48%	30,070	0.91%	2.71
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	641	0.86%	101,112	3.08%	0.28	864	1.17%	128,882	3.92%	0.30
Total	26,072	35.16%	954,301	29.03%	1.21	44,624	60.18%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.05

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2,915	3.93%	418,294	12.73%	0.31	60,323	81.35%	2,584,969	78.64%	1.03
Hispanic	56	0.08%	5,962	0.18%	0.42	4,815	6.49%	275,314	8.38%	0.78
Asian	251	0.34%	6,981	0.21%	1.59	1,686	2.27%	90,686	2.76%	0.82
Native American	28	0.04%	2,254	0.07%	0.55	2,006	2.71%	40,604	1.24%	2.19
African American	65	0.09%	3,616	0.11%	0.80	3,676	4.96%	51,123	1.56%	3.19
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown	145	0.20%	6,797	0.21%	0.95	1,650	2.23%	236,791	7.20%	0.31
Total	3,460	4.67%	444,133	13.51%	0.35	74,156	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Source of Population data: Excel spreadsheet: Hank_Baldrerra_Children_Programs Tab: Popn2000&2003
 Hispanic Data: Hispanic or Latino Pop 1999 and 2000 Oregon Counties Tab: 2000HorL

Statewide -- Client Processing and Monitoring System -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1,430	13.89%	686,301	20.88%	0.67	6,965	67.67%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.50
Hispanic	153	1.49%	107,775	3.28%	0.45	468	4.55%	161,577	4.92%	0.92
Asian	22	0.21%	24,712	0.75%	0.28	81	0.79%	58,993	1.79%	0.44
Native American	133	1.29%	14,480	0.44%	2.93	259	2.52%	23,870	0.73%	3.46
African American	52	0.51%	17,437	0.53%	0.95	140	1.36%	30,070	0.91%	1.49
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	33	0.32%	101,112	3.08%	0.10	102	0.99%	128,882	3.92%	0.25
Total	1,823	17.71%	954,301	29.03%	0.61	8,015	77.87%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.36

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	431	4.19%	418,294	12.73%	0.33	8,826	85.75%	2,584,969	78.64%	1.09
Hispanic	7	0.07%	5,962	0.18%	0.37	628	6.10%	275,314	8.38%	0.73
Asian	5	0.05%	6,981	0.21%	0.23	108	1.05%	90,686	2.76%	0.38
Native American	2	0.02%	2,254	0.07%	0.28	394	3.83%	40,604	1.24%	3.10
African American	3	0.03%	3,616	0.11%	0.26	195	1.89%	51,123	1.56%	1.22
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown	7	0.07%	6,797	0.21%	0.33	142	1.38%	236,791	7.20%	0.19
Total	455	4.42%	444,133	13.51%	0.33	10,293	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Source of Population data: Excel spreadsheet: Hank_Baldrrama_Children_Programs Tab: Popn2000&2003
 Hispanic Data: Hispanic or Latino Pop 1999 and 2000 Oregon Counties Tab: 2000HorL
Source of Service data: Hank_Baldrrama_Children_Programs **Tab:** CPMS2003 **Data:** Crisis

Oregon State
MMIS -- Inpatient Services -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	276	14.03%	686,301	20.89%	0.67	1,349	68.58%	1,480,374	45.07%	1.52
Hispanic	15	0.76%	107,775	3.28%	0.23	38	1.93%	161,577	4.92%	0.39
Asian	9	0.46%	24,712	0.75%	0.61	31	1.58%	58,993	1.80%	0.88
Native American	12	0.61%	14,480	0.44%	1.38	22	1.12%	23,870	0.73%	1.54
African American	21	1.07%	17,437	0.53%	2.01	86	4.37%	30,070	0.92%	4.78
Hawaiian/Pac Is	2	0.10%	2,484	0.08%	1.34	2	0.10%	6,329	0.19%	0.53
Other/Unknown	17	0.86%	100,586	3.06%	0.28	9	0.46%	23,145	0.70%	0.65
Total	352	17.90%	953,796	29.04%	0.62	1,537	78.14%	1,888,091	54.32%	1.44

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	71	3.61%	418,294	12.73%	0.28	1,696	86.22%	2,583,845	78.66%	1.10
Hispanic	2	0.10%	5,962	0.18%	0.56	55	2.80%	275,313	8.38%	0.33
Asian	2	0.10%	6,981	0.21%	0.48	42	2.14%	90,686	2.76%	0.77
Native American	2	0.10%	2,254	0.07%	1.48	36	1.83%	40,605	1.24%	1.48
African American			3,616	0.11%		107	5.44%	51,124	1.56%	3.50
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%		4	0.20%	7,442	0.23%	0.90
Other/Unknown	1	0.05%	1,609	0.05%	1.04	27	1.37%	125,326	3.82%	0.36
Total	78	3.97%	439,121	13.36%	0.30	1,967	100.00%	3,284,890	96.63%	1.03

Source of Population data: Excel spreadsheet: Hank_Balderrama_Children_Programs Tab: Popn2000&2003

Excel spreadsheet: Hank_Balderrama_Children_Programs Tab: Popn2000&2003

Hispanic Data: Hispanic or Latino Pop 1999 and 2000 Oregon Counties Tab: 2000HorL

Source of Service data: Hank_Balderrama_Children_Programs Tab: MMIS2003 Data: Inpatients

Statewide -- Oregon Patient / Resident Care System -- Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	243	3.69%	686,301	20.88%	0.18	4,019	61.02%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.35
Hispanic	15	0.23%	107,775	3.28%	0.07	153	2.32%	161,577	4.92%	0.47
Asian	2	0.03%	24,712	0.75%	0.04	70	1.06%	58,993	1.79%	0.59
Native American	7	0.11%	14,480	0.44%	0.24	63	0.96%	23,870	0.73%	1.32
African American	22	0.33%	17,437	0.53%	0.63	261	3.96%	30,070	0.91%	4.33
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	45	0.68%	101,112	3.08%	0.22	1,305	19.81%	128,882	3.92%	5.05
Total	334	5.07%	954,301	29.03%	0.17	5,871	89.14%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.55

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	236	3.58%	418,294	12.73%	0.28	4,498	68.30%	2,584,969	78.64%	0.87
Hispanic			5,962	0.18%		168	2.55%	275,314	8.38%	0.30
Asian			6,981	0.21%		72	1.09%	90,686	2.76%	0.40
Native American	3	0.05%	2,254	0.07%	0.66	73	1.11%	40,604	1.24%	0.90
African American	6	0.09%	3,616	0.11%	0.83	289	4.39%	51,123	1.56%	2.82
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown	136	2.06%	6,797	0.21%	9.99	1,486	22.56%	236,791	7.20%	3.13
Total	381	5.78%	444,133	13.51%	0.43	6,586	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Source of Population data: Excel spreadsheet: Hank_Baldrara_Children_Programs Tab: Popn2000&2003
 Hispanic Data: Hispanic or Latino Pop 1999 and 2000 Oregon Counties Tab: 2000HorL

Source of Service data: Hank_Baldrara_Children_Programs Tab: OPRCS2003 Data: Acute

Statewide -- Oregon Patient / Resident Care System -- State Hospital Long Term



Ethnicity	Under 18				CA Ratio	Between 18 and 64				CA Ratio
	Served		Census			Served		Census		
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	61	7.52%	686,301	20.88%	0.36	547	67.45%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.50
Hispanic	4	0.49%	107,775	3.28%	0.15	35	4.32%	161,577	4.92%	0.88
Asian	2	0.25%	24,712	0.75%	0.33	17	2.10%	58,993	1.79%	1.17
Native American	3	0.37%	14,480	0.44%	0.84	13	1.60%	23,870	0.73%	2.21
African American	9	1.11%	17,437	0.53%	2.09	51	6.29%	30,070	0.91%	6.87
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown			101,112	3.08%				128,882	3.92%	
Total	79	9.74%	954,301	29.03%	0.34	663	81.75%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.42



Ethnicity	Over 65				CA Ratio	Total				CA Ratio
	Served		Census			Served		Census		
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	64	7.89%	418,294	12.73%	0.62	672	82.86%	2,584,969	78.64%	1.05
Hispanic			5,962	0.18%		39	4.81%	275,314	8.38%	0.57
Asian			6,981	0.21%		19	2.34%	90,686	2.76%	0.85
Native American			2,254	0.07%		16	1.97%	40,604	1.24%	1.60
African American	5	0.62%	3,616	0.11%	5.60	65	8.01%	51,123	1.56%	5.15
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown			6,797	0.21%				236,791	7.20%	
Total	69	8.51%	444,133	13.51%	0.63	811	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	



Source of Population data: Excel spreadsheet: Hank_Baldrara_Children_Programs Tab: Popn2000&2003
 Hispanic Data: Hispanic or Latino Pop 1999 and 2000 Oregon Counties Tab:
 2000HorL



Source of Service data: Hank_Baldrara_Children_Programs **Tab:** OPRCS2003 **Data:** St Hosp Long Term



Statewide Comparison of Service Access by Population Outpatient Services





















Crisis Services





















Inpatient Services











Statewide Comparable Access Ratio - Crisis Services - by MHO by County

Statewide -- Client Processing and Monitoring System -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1,430	13.89%	686,301	20.88%	0.67	6,965	67.67%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.50
Hispanic	153	1.49%	107,775	3.28%	0.45	468	4.55%	161,577	4.92%	0.92
Asian	22	0.21%	24,712	0.75%	0.28	81	0.79%	58,993	1.79%	0.44
Native American	133	1.29%	14,480	0.44%	2.93	259	2.52%	23,870	0.73%	3.46
African American	52	0.51%	17,437	0.53%	0.95	140	1.36%	30,070	0.91%	1.49
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	33	0.32%	101,112	3.08%	0.10	102	0.99%	128,882	3.92%	0.25
Total	1,823	17.71%	954,301	29.03%	0.61	8,015	77.87%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.36

Accountable Behavioral Health Alliance -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Benton, Lincoln, Crook, Deschutes and Jefferson Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	269	17.12%	56,711	22.17%	0.77	1,023	65.12%	124,628	48.72%	1.34
Hispanic	13	0.83%	5,673	2.22%	0.37	39	2.48%	8,508	3.33%	0.75
Asian	1	0.06%	923	0.36%	0.18	11	0.70%	3,314	1.30%	0.54
Native American	11	0.70%	2,263	0.88%	0.79	46	2.93%	3,059	1.20%	2.45
African American	4	0.25%	323	0.13%	2.02	7	0.45%	678	0.27%	1.68
Hawaiian/Pac Is			92	0.04%				256	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	4	0.25%	5,230	2.04%	0.12	9	0.57%	6,821	2.67%	0.21
Total	302	19.22%	71,215	27.84%	0.69	1,135	72.25%	147,264	57.57%	1.25

Benton County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	4.83%	14,530	19.82%	0.24	123	84.83%	39,395	53.73%	1.58
Hispanic			1,190	1.62%		6	4.14%	2,394	3.26%	1.27
Asian	1	0.69%	565	0.77%	0.90	3	2.07%	2,577	3.51%	0.59
Native American			163	0.22%				382	0.52%	
African American			165	0.23%		1	0.69%	457	0.62%	1.11
Hawaiian/Pac Is			34	0.05%				142	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			1,201	1.64%		3	2.07%	2,043	2.79%	0.74
Total	8	5.52%	17,848	24.34%	0.23	136	93.79%	47,390	64.63%	1.45

Statewide -- Client Processing and Monitoring System -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	431	4.19%	418,294	12.73%	0.33	8,826	85.75%	2,584,969	78.64%	1.09
Hispanic	7	0.07%	5,962	0.18%	0.37	628	6.10%	275,314	8.38%	0.73
Asian	5	0.05%	6,981	0.21%	0.23	108	1.05%	90,686	2.76%	0.38
Native American	2	0.02%	2,254	0.07%	0.28	394	3.83%	40,604	1.24%	3.10
African American	3	0.03%	3,616	0.11%	0.26	195	1.89%	51,123	1.56%	1.22
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown	7	0.07%	6,797	0.21%	0.33	142	1.38%	236,791	7.20%	0.19
Total	455	4.42%	444,133	13.51%	0.33	10,293	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Accountable Behavioral Health Alliance -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Benton, Lincoln, Crook, Deschutes and Jefferson Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	132	8.40%	35,983	14.07%	0.60	1,424	90.64%	217,322	84.96%	1.07
Hispanic	1	0.06%	341	0.13%	0.48	53	3.37%	14,522	5.68%	0.59
Asian			243	0.09%		12	0.76%	4,480	1.75%	0.44
Native American			296	0.12%		57	3.63%	5,618	2.20%	1.65
African American			23	0.01%		11	0.70%	1,024	0.40%	1.75
Hawaiian/Pac Is			17	0.01%				365	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.06%	420	0.16%	0.39	14	0.89%	12,471	4.88%	0.18
Total	134	8.53%	37,323	14.59%	0.58	1,571	100.00%	255,802	100.00%	

Benton County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	0.69%	7,750	10.57%	0.07	131	90.34%	61,675	84.11%	1.07
Hispanic			61	0.08%		6	4.14%	3,645	4.97%	0.83
Asian			145	0.20%		4	2.76%	3,287	4.48%	0.62
Native American			25	0.03%				570	0.78%	
African American			12	0.02%		1	0.69%	634	0.86%	0.80
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				180	0.25%	
Other/Unknown			90	0.12%		3	2.07%	3,334	4.55%	0.46
Total	1	0.69%	8,087	11.03%	0.06	145	100.00%	73,325	100.00%	1.00

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	53	17.73%	8,008	20.11%	0.88	201	67.22%	17,463	43.85%	1.53
Hispanic	3	1.00%	777	1.95%	0.51	3	1.00%	1,276	3.20%	0.31
Asian			112	0.28%		2	0.67%	182	0.46%	1.46
Native American	5	1.67%	504	1.27%	1.32	18	6.02%	678	1.70%	3.54
African American	2	0.67%	45	0.11%	5.92			76	0.19%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.05%				43	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			848	2.13%		1	0.33%	1,041	2.61%	0.13
Total	63	21.07%	10,312	25.89%	0.81	225	75.25%	20,759	52.13%	1.44

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	19	21.11%	4,575	25.67%	0.82	59	65.56%	8,144	45.69%	1.43
Hispanic			481	2.70%		2	2.22%	579	3.25%	0.68
Asian			28	0.16%				41	0.23%	
Native American			70	0.39%		2	2.22%	133	0.75%	2.98
African American			1	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				1	0.01%	
Other/Unknown	1	1.11%	423	2.37%	0.47			499	2.80%	
Total	20	22.22%	5,581	31.31%	0.71	63	70.00%	9,403	52.75%	1.33

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	182	18.76%	26,394	25.21%	0.74	610	62.89%	53,729	51.32%	1.23
Hispanic	8	0.82%	1,709	1.63%	0.51	23	2.37%	2,456	2.35%	1.01
Asian			205	0.20%		5	0.52%	488	0.47%	1.11
Native American	3	0.31%	292	0.28%	1.11	11	1.13%	487	0.47%	2.44
African American	2	0.21%	94	0.09%	2.30	6	0.62%	116	0.11%	5.58
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.02%				50	0.05%	
Other/Unknown	3	0.31%	1,580	1.51%	0.20	5	0.52%	1,840	1.76%	0.29
Total	198	20.41%	30,292	28.94%	0.71	660	68.04%	59,166	56.52%	1.20

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	11	3.68%	8,463	21.25%	0.17	265	88.63%	33,934	85.21%	1.04
Hispanic			66	0.17%		6	2.01%	2,119	5.32%	0.38
Asian			40	0.10%		2	0.67%	334	0.84%	0.80
Native American			66	0.17%		23	7.69%	1,248	3.13%	2.45
African American			1	0.00%		2	0.67%	122	0.31%	2.18
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				65	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			112	0.28%		1	0.33%	2,001	5.02%	0.07
Total	11	3.68%	8,752	21.98%	0.17	299	100.00%	39,823	100.00%	1.00

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	7.78%	2,772	15.55%	0.50	85	94.44%	15,491	86.91%	1.09
Hispanic			22	0.12%		2	2.22%	1,082	6.07%	0.37
Asian			3	0.02%				72	0.40%	
Native American			15	0.08%		2	2.22%	218	1.22%	1.82
African American								7	0.04%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.15%		1	1.11%	948	5.32%	0.21
Total	7	7.78%	2,840	15.93%	0.49	90	100.00%	17,824	100.00%	1.00

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	110	11.34%	14,825	14.16%	0.80	902	92.99%	94,948	90.70%	1.03
Hispanic	1	0.10%	139	0.13%	0.78	32	3.30%	4,304	4.11%	0.80
Asian			49	0.05%		5	0.52%	742	0.71%	0.73
Native American			59	0.06%		14	1.44%	838	0.80%	1.80
African American			4	0.00%		8	0.82%	214	0.20%	4.03
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				75	0.07%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.10%	145	0.14%	0.74	9	0.93%	3,565	3.41%	0.27
Total	112	11.55%	15,228	14.55%	0.79	970	100.00%	104,686	100.00%	1.00

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	8	11.94%	3,204	15.91%	0.75	30	44.78%	5,897	29.27%	1.53
Hispanic	2	2.99%	1,516	7.53%	0.40	5	7.46%	1,803	8.95%	0.83
Asian			13	0.06%		1	1.49%	26	0.13%	11.56
Native American	3	4.48%	1,234	6.13%	0.73	15	22.39%	1,379	6.85%	3.27
African American			18	0.09%				23	0.11%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			19	0.09%				20	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			1,178	5.85%				1,398	6.94%	
Total	13	19.40%	7,182	35.65%	0.54	51	76.12%	10,546	52.35%	1.45

Clackamas County Mental Health -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Clackamas, (includes Family Care Services) Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco Counties -- CY2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	32	10.06%	87,600	24.30%	0.41	248	77.99%	171,079	47.45%	1.64
Hispanic	5	1.57%	9,493	2.63%	0.60	10	3.14%	14,212	3.94%	0.80
Asian			2,255	0.63%		3	0.94%	4,764	1.32%	0.71
Native American	1	0.31%	1,178	0.33%	0.96	6	1.89%	1,868	0.52%	3.64
African American			822	0.23%		4	1.26%	1,310	0.36%	3.46
Hawaiian/Pac Is			234	0.06%				392	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			9,131	2.53%		1	0.31%	10,956	3.04%	0.10
Total	38	11.95%	110,713	30.71%	0.39	272	85.53%	204,581	56.75%	1.51

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	10	5.52%	77,943	25.09%	0.22	158	87.29%	152,535	49.10%	1.78
Hispanic	1	0.55%	6,340	2.04%	0.27	3	1.66%	10,049	3.23%	0.51
Asian			2,157	0.69%		2	1.10%	4,536	1.46%	0.76
Native American			719	0.23%		4	2.21%	1,324	0.43%	5.19
African American			758	0.24%		2	1.10%	1,205	0.39%	2.85
Hawaiian/Pac Is			180	0.06%				316	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			6,763	2.18%				8,053	2.59%	
Total	11	6.08%	94,860	30.53%	0.20	169	93.37%	178,018	57.30%	1.63

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	4.48%	2,173	10.79%	0.42	41	61.19%	11,274	55.97%	1.09
Hispanic			53	0.26%		7	10.45%	3,372	16.74%	0.62
Asian			6	0.03%		1	1.49%	45	0.22%	6.68
Native American			131	0.65%		18	26.87%	2,744	13.62%	1.97
African American			6	0.03%				47	0.23%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								39	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			47	0.23%				2,623	13.02%	
Total	3	4.48%	2,416	11.99%	0.37	67	100.00%	20,144	100.00%	1.00

Clackamas County Mental Health -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Clackamas, (includes Family Care Services) Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco Counties -- CY2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	2.20%	43,271	12.00%	0.18	287	90.25%	301,950	83.75%	1.08
Hispanic			489	0.14%		15	4.72%	24,194	6.71%	0.70
Asian	1	0.31%	651	0.18%	1.74	4	1.26%	7,670	2.13%	0.59
Native American			182	0.05%		7	2.20%	3,228	0.90%	2.46
African American			94	0.03%		4	1.26%	2,226	0.62%	2.04
Hawaiian/Pac Is			16	0.00%				642	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			520	0.14%		1	0.31%	20,607	5.72%	0.06
Total	8	2.52%	45,223	12.54%	0.20	318	100.00%	360,517	100.00%	

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			36,295	11.68%		168	92.82%	266,773	85.87%	1.08
Hispanic			355	0.11%		4	2.21%	16,744	5.39%	0.41
Asian	1	0.55%	540	0.17%	3.18	3	1.66%	7,233	2.33%	0.71
Native American			114	0.04%		4	2.21%	2,157	0.69%	3.18
African American			81	0.03%		2	1.10%	2,044	0.66%	1.68
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.00%				509	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			385	0.12%				15,201	4.89%	
Total	1	0.55%	37,783	12.16%	0.05	181	100.00%	310,661	100.00%	1.00

**Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- CY2003**

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	22	16.06%	9,657	19.37%	0.83	90	65.69%	18,544	37.20%	1.77
Hispanic	4	2.92%	3,153	6.32%	0.46	7	5.11%	4,163	8.35%	0.61
Asian			98	0.20%		1	0.73%	228	0.46%	1.60
Native American	1	0.73%	459	0.92%	0.79	2	1.46%	544	1.09%	1.34
African American			64	0.13%		2	1.46%	105	0.21%	6.93
Hawaiian/Pac Is			54	0.11%				76	0.15%	
Other/Unknown			2,368	4.75%		1	0.73%	2,903	5.82%	0.13
Total	27	19.71%	15,853	31.80%	0.62	103	75.18%	26,563	53.28%	1.41

Greater Oregon Behavioral Health, Inc -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

**Baker, Grant, Harney, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa,
 Wheeler, Clatsop and Columbia Counties - Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	169	18.29%	57,757	22.18%	0.82	623	67.42%	110,272	42.34%	1.59
Hispanic	12	1.30%	11,653	4.47%	0.29	48	5.19%	14,600	5.61%	0.93
Asian	2	0.22%	486	0.19%	1.16	5	0.54%	1,076	0.41%	1.31
Native American	7	0.76%	1,642	0.63%	1.20	13	1.41%	2,466	0.95%	1.49
African American	1	0.11%	335	0.13%	0.84	6	0.65%	1,034	0.40%	1.64
Hawaiian/Pac Is			138	0.05%				257	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.22%	9,762	3.75%	0.06	5	0.54%	11,218	4.31%	0.13
Total	193	20.89%	81,773	31.40%	0.67	700	75.76%	140,923	54.11%	1.40

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,807	25.61%				6,893	46.37%	
Hispanic			158	1.06%				214	1.44%	
Asian			10	0.07%		1	100%	31	0.21%	479.55
Native American			63	0.42%				84	0.57%	
African American			9	0.06%				25	0.17%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				2	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			162	1.09%				200	1.35%	
Total		0.00%	4,212	28.33%		1	100.00%	7,449	50.11%	2.00

**Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- CY2003**

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	5.11%	6,976	13.99%	0.37	119	86.86%	35,177	70.56%	1.23
Hispanic			134	0.27%		11	8.03%	7,450	14.94%	0.54
Asian			111	0.22%		1	0.73%	437	0.88%	0.83
Native American			68	0.14%		3	2.19%	1,071	2.15%	1.02
African American			13	0.03%		2	1.46%	182	0.37%	4.00
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				133	0.27%	
Other/Unknown			135	0.27%		1	0.73%	5,406	10.84%	0.07
Total	7	5.11%	7,440	14.92%	0.34	137	100.00%	49,856	100.00%	1.00

Greater Oregon Behavioral Health, Inc -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

**Baker, Grant, Harney, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa,
 Wheeler, Clatsop and Columbia Counties - Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	31	3.35%	35,659	13.69%	0.25	823	89.07%	203,688	78.21%	1.14
Hispanic			667	0.26%		60	6.49%	26,920	10.34%	0.63
Asian			402	0.15%		7	0.76%	1,964	0.75%	1.00
Native American			267	0.10%		20	2.16%	4,375	1.68%	1.29
African American			60	0.02%		7	0.76%	1,429	0.55%	1.38
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				413	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			676	0.26%		7	0.76%	21,656	8.31%	0.09
Total	31	3.35%	37,749	14.49%	0.23	924	100.00%	260,445	100.00%	

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,135	21.09%				13,835	93.06%	
Hispanic			20	0.13%				392	2.64%	
Asian			10	0.07%		1	100.00%	51	0.34%	291.49
Native American			12	0.08%				159	1.07%	
African American			2	0.01%				36	0.24%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								5	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.17%				388	2.61%	
Total		0.00%	3,205	21.56%		1	100.00%	14,866	100.00%	1.00

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	49	20.76%	7,613	23.48%	0.88	167	70.76%	15,592	48.08%	1.47
Hispanic			599	1.85%		5	2.12%	966	2.98%	0.71
Asian			96	0.30%				209	0.64%	
Native American			116	0.36%		2	0.85%	189	0.58%	1.45
African American			52	0.16%		2	0.85%	124	0.38%	2.22
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.06%				31	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			537	1.66%		2	0.85%	706	2.18%	0.39
Total	49	20.76%	9,033	27.86%	0.75	178	75.42%	17,817	54.94%	1.37

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	53	29.12%	10,965	28.01%	1.04	118	64.84%	19,954	50.98%	1.27
Hispanic	2	1.10%	500	1.28%	0.86	3	1.65%	563	1.44%	1.15
Asian			68	0.17%				117	0.30%	
Native American	1	0.55%	176	0.45%	1.22	1	0.55%	299	0.76%	0.72
African American			41	0.10%				47	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			10	0.03%				26	0.07%	
Other/Unknown	2	1.10%	642	1.64%	0.67			642	1.64%	
Total	58	31.87%	12,402	31.68%	1.01	122	67.03%	21,648	55.30%	1.21

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	12	20.00%	1,922	27.34%	0.73	39	65.00%	3,335	47.44%	1.37
Hispanic			64	0.91%		1	1.67%	93	1.32%	1.26
Asian			3	0.04%				10	0.14%	
Native American			52	0.74%		3	5.00%	52	0.74%	6.76
African American			3	0.04%				3	0.04%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			65	0.92%				90	1.28%	
Total	12	20.00%	2,109	30.00%	0.67	43	71.67%	3,585	51.00%	1.41

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	9	3.81%	5,396	16.64%	0.23	225	95.34%	28,601	88.20%	1.08
Hispanic			32	0.10%		5	2.12%	1,597	4.92%	0.43
Asian			56	0.17%				361	1.11%	
Native American			22	0.07%		2	0.85%	327	1.01%	0.84
African American			5	0.02%		2	0.85%	181	0.56%	1.52
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				54	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			63	0.19%		2	0.85%	1,306	4.03%	0.21
Total	9	3.81%	557	17.20%	0.22	236	100.00%	32,427	100.00%	1.00

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	1.10%	4,932	12.60%	0.09	173	95.05%	35,851	91.59%	1.04
Hispanic			30	0.08%		5	2.75%	1,093	2.79%	0.98
Asian			22	0.06%				207	0.53%	
Native American			37	0.09%		2	1.10%	512	1.31%	0.84
African American			9	0.02%				97	0.25%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				38	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			61	0.16%		2	1.10%	1,345	3.44%	0.32
Total	2	1.10%	5,093	13.01%	0.08	182	100.00%	39,143	100.00%	1.00

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	5	8.33%	1,308	18.61%	0.45	56	93.33%	6,565	93.39%	1.00
Hispanic			6	0.09%		1	1.67%	163	2.32%	0.72
Asian								13	0.18%	
Native American			7	0.10%		3	5.00%	111	1.58%	3.17
African American								6	0.09%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			15	0.21%				170	2.42%	
Total	5	8.33%	1,336	19.00%	0.44	60	100.00%	7,030	100.00%	1.00

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	16.67%	1,754	25.22%	0.66	4	66.67%	3,229	46.42%	1.44
Hispanic			143	2.06%				167	2.40%	
Asian			5	0.07%				23	0.33%	
Native American			100	1.44%				157	2.26%	
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.04%	
Other/Unknown			112	1.61%				113	1.62%	
Total	1	16.67%	2,118	30.45%	0.55	4	66.67%	3,697	53.15%	1.25

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	15.38%	1,579	23.21%	0.66	10	76.92%	2,915	42.84%	1.80
Hispanic			172	2.53%				221	3.25%	
Asian	1	7.69%	19	0.28%	27.55			23	0.34%	
Native American			74	1.09%				86	1.26%	
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								6	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			171	2.51%				204	3.00%	
Total	3	23.08%	2,019	29.67%	0.78	10	76.92%	3,460	50.85%	1.51

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	13	9.63%	5,778	15.78%	0.61	83	61.48%	11,633	31.77%	1.94
Hispanic	7	5.19%	3,501	9.56%	0.54	25	18.52%	4,329	11.82%	1.57
Asian	1	0.74%	79	0.22%	3.43	1	0.74%	215	0.59%	1.26
Native American	2	1.48%	97	0.26%	5.59	1	0.74%	186	0.51%	1.46
African American			43	0.12%				332	0.91%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			9	0.02%				10	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			2,728	7.45%				3,088	8.43%	
Total	23	17.04%	12,235	33.41%	0.51	110	81.48%	19,793	54.05%	1.51

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	16.67%	1,106	15.90%	1.05	6	100.00%	6,089	87.54%	1.14
Hispanic			6	0.09%				316	4.54%	
Asian			7	0.10%				35	0.50%	
Native American			19	0.27%				276	3.97%	
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.14%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.03%				5	0.07%	
Other/Unknown								225	3.23%	
Total	1	16.67%	1,141	16.40%	1.02	6	100.00%	6,956	100.00%	1.00

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,288	18.93%		12	92.31%	5,782	84.98%	1.09
Hispanic			11	0.16%				404	5.94%	
Asian			4	0.06%		1	7.69%	46	0.68%	11.38
Native American			4	0.06%				164	2.41%	
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.15%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.04%				9	0.13%	
Other/Unknown			14	0.21%				389	5.72%	
Total		0.00%	1,325	19.47%		13	100.00%	6,804	100.00%	1.00

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	1.48%	3,872	10.57%	0.14	98	72.59%	21,283	58.12%	1.25
Hispanic			269	0.73%		32	23.70%	8,099	22.12%	1.07
Asian			249	0.68%		2	1.48%	543	1.48%	1.00
Native American			13	0.04%		3	2.22%	296	0.81%	2.75
African American			9	0.02%				384	1.05%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				22	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			175	0.48%				5,991	16.36%	
Total	2	1.48%	4,590	12.53%	0.12	135	100.00%	36,618	100.00%	1.00

Morrow and Wheeler Counties -- Calendar Year 2003 CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	11.54%	2,525	18.20%	0.63	18	69.23%	4,524	32.61%	2.12
Hispanic			1,263	9.11%		3	11.54%	1,460	10.53%	1.10
Asian			15	0.11%				22	0.16%	
Native American			65	0.47%		1	3.85%	85	0.61%	6.28
African American			7	0.05%				8	0.06%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.03%				5	0.04%	
Other/Unknown			1,120	8.07%				1,197	8.63%	
Total	3	11.54%	4,999	36.04%	0.32	22	84.62%	7,301	52.63%	1.61

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003 CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	25	14.20%	14,567	19.59%	0.73	116	65.91%	28,205	37.93%	1.74
Hispanic	3	1.70%	4,949	6.66%	0.26	11	6.25%	6,185	8.32%	0.75
Asian			140	0.19%		2	1.14%	284	0.38%	2.98
Native American	3	1.70%	821	1.10%	1.54	4	2.27%	1,182	1.59%	1.43
African American	1	0.57%	136	0.18%	3.11	4	2.27%	409	0.55%	4.13
Hawaiian/Pac Is			46	0.06%				69	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			3,882	5.22%		2	1.14%	4,570	6.15%	0.18
Total	32	18.18%	24,541	33.00%	0.55	139	78.98%	40,904	55.01%	1.44

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003 CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	6	11.11%	5,591	25.33%	0.44	42	77.78%	11,046	50.05%	1.55
Hispanic			239	1.08%				346	1.57%	
Asian			49	0.22%		1	1.85%	136	0.62%	3.01
Native American			61	0.28%				119	0.54%	
African American			36	0.16%				74	0.34%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			45	0.20%				101	0.46%	
Other/Unknown			264	1.20%				335	1.52%	
Total	6	11.11%	6,285	28.47%	0.39	43	79.63%	12,157	55.08%	1.45

Morrow and Wheeler Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	3.85%	1,475	10.63%	0.36	22	84.62%	8,524	61.45%	1.38
Hispanic			42	0.30%		3	11.54%	2,765	19.93%	0.58
Asian			6	0.04%				43	0.31%	
Native American			4	0.03%		1	3.85%	154	1.11%	3.46
African American			1	0.01%				16	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.01%				10	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			42	0.30%				2,359	17.01%	
Total	1	3.85%	1,571	11.33%	0.34	26	100.00%	13,871	100.00%	1.00

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	5	2.84%	8,260	11.11%	0.26	146	82.95%	51,032	68.63%	1.21
Hispanic			232	0.31%		14	7.95%	11,366	15.29%	0.52
Asian			38	0.05%		2	1.14%	462	0.62%	1.83
Native American			137	0.18%		7	3.98%	2,140	2.88%	1.38
African American			24	0.03%		5	2.84%	569	0.77%	3.71
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.00%				117	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			220	0.30%		2	1.14%	8,672	11.66%	0.10
Total	5	2.84%	8,913	11.99%	0.24	176	100.00%	74,358	100.00%	1.00

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	5	9.26%	3,535	16.02%	0.58	53	98.15%	20,172	91.39%	1.07
Hispanic			15	0.07%				600	2.72%	
Asian			8	0.04%		1	1.85%	193	0.87%	2.12
Native American			10	0.05%				190	0.86%	
African American			8	0.04%				118	0.53%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				148	0.67%	
Other/Unknown			52	0.24%				651	2.95%	
Total	5	9.26%	3,630	16.45%	0.56	54	100.00%	22,072	100.00%	1.00

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	5	14.29%	1,656	26.29%	0.54	26	74.29%	2,946	46.76%	1.59
Hispanic			65	1.03%				56	0.89%	
Asian			2	0.03%				6	0.10%	
Native American	1	2.86%	17	0.27%	10.59	1	2.86%	27	0.43%	6.67
African American								2	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.02%				2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			79	1.25%		1	2.86%	73	1.16%	2.47
Total	6	17.14%	1,820	28.89%	0.59	28	80.00%	3,112	49.40%	1.62

Jefferson Behavioral Health -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

**Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine and Klamath Counties
 Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	169	9.49%	105,272	22.70%	0.42	1,377	77.36%	208,560	44.97%	1.72
Hispanic	4	0.22%	11,196	2.41%	0.09	45	2.53%	14,214	3.06%	0.82
Asian	1	0.06%	934	0.20%	0.28	8	0.45%	1,986	0.43%	1.05
Native American	4	0.22%	2,938	0.63%	0.35	52	2.92%	4,510	0.97%	3.00
African American	3	0.17%	560	0.12%	1.40	11	0.62%	943	0.20%	3.04
Hawaiian/Pac Is			208	0.04%				382	0.08%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.06%	10,203	2.20%	0.03	15	0.84%	11,534	2.49%	0.34
Total	182	10.22%	131,311	28.31%	0.36	1,508	84.72%	242,129	52.20%	1.62

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	9	18.37%	12,022	21.50%	0.85	33	67.35%	25,648	45.88%	1.47
Hispanic			863	1.54%		1	2.04%	1,135	2.03%	1.01
Asian			131	0.23%				276	0.49%	
Native American	1	2.04%	504	0.90%	2.26	1	2.04%	729	1.30%	1.57
African American			70	0.13%		1	2.04%	99	0.18%	11.52
Hawaiian/Pac Is			29	0.05%				51	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			1,013	1.81%				1,180	2.11%	
Total	10	20.41%	14,632	26.17%	0.78	36	73.47%	29,118	52.08%	1.41

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	2.86%	1,352	21.46%	0.13	32	91.43%	5,954	94.51%	0.97
Hispanic			4	0.06%				125	1.98%	
Asian			2	0.03%				10	0.16%	
Native American			2	0.03%		2	5.71%	46	0.73%	7.83
African American								2	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			8	0.13%		1	2.86%	160	2.54%	1.13
Total	1	2.86%	1,368	21.71%	0.13	35	100.00%	6,300	100.00%	1.00

Jefferson Behavioral Health -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

**Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine and Klamath Counties
 Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	85	4.78%	86,716	18.70%	0.26	1,631	91.63%	400,548	86.36%	1.06
Hispanic	1	0.06%	1,083	0.23%	0.24	50	2.81%	26,493	5.71%	0.49
Asian	1	0.06%	405	0.09%	0.64	10	0.56%	3,325	0.72%	0.78
Native American			619	0.13%		56	3.15%	8,067	1.74%	1.81
African American			131	0.03%		14	0.79%	1,634	0.35%	2.23
Hawaiian/Pac Is			48	0.01%				638	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	3	0.17%	1,365	0.29%	0.57	19	1.07%	23,102	4.98%	0.21
Total	90	5.06%	90,367	19.48%	0.26	1,780	100.00%	463,807	100.00%	

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3	6.12%	11,610	20.77%	0.29	45	91.84%	49,280	88.15%	1.04
Hispanic			135	0.24%		1	2.04%	2,133	3.82%	0.53
Asian			72	0.13%				479	0.86%	
Native American			108	0.19%		2	4.08%	1,341	2.40%	1.70
African American			17	0.03%		1	2.04%	186	0.33%	6.13
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.02%				93	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			200	0.36%				2,393	4.28%	
Total	3	6.12%	12,155	21.74%	0.28	49	100.00%	55,905	100.00%	1.00

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	22	16.06%	3,559	19.07%	0.84	95	69.34%	7,548	40.43%	1.71
Hispanic	1	0.73%	319	1.71%	0.43	2	1.46%	405	2.17%	0.67
Asian			35	0.19%		1	0.73%	65	0.35%	2.10
Native American			155	0.83%		2	1.46%	215	1.15%	1.27
African American			5	0.03%		1	0.73%	17	0.09%	8.02
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.04%				10	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			304	1.63%				358	1.92%	
Total	23	16.79%	4,384	23.49%	0.71	101	73.72%	8,618	46.17%	1.60

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	18	8.87%	21,936	24.31%	0.36	170	83.74%	42,098	46.66%	1.79
Hispanic			1,349	1.50%		5	2.46%	1,768	1.96%	1.26
Asian	1	0.49%	157	0.17%	2.83	1	0.49%	302	0.33%	1.47
Native American			490	0.54%		3	1.48%	739	0.82%	1.80
African American			55	0.06%				104	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			23	0.03%				62	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			1,418	1.57%		1	0.49%	1,675	1.86%	0.27
Total	19	9.36%	25,428	28.18%	0.33	180	88.67%	46,748	51.81%	1.71

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	5.45%	38,601	22.71%	0.24	48	87.27%	77,000	45.29%	1.93
Hispanic			5,158	3.03%		1	1.82%	6,616	3.89%	0.47
Asian			366	0.22%				872	0.51%	
Native American			561	0.33%		1	1.82%	1,093	0.64%	2.83
African American			240	0.14%		1	1.82%	427	0.25%	7.24
Hawaiian/Pac Is			97	0.06%				183	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			4,395	2.59%				5,057	2.97%	
Total	3	5.45%	49,418	29.07%	0.19	51	92.73%	91,248	53.67%	1.73

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	13	9.49%	5,471	29.31%	0.32	130	94.89%	16,578	88.81%	1.07
Hispanic			37	0.20%		3	2.19%	761	4.08%	0.54
Asian			17	0.09%		1	0.73%	117	0.63%	1.16
Native American			35	0.19%		2	1.46%	405	2.17%	0.67
African American			7	0.04%		1	0.73%	29	0.16%	4.70
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				20	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			95	0.51%				757	4.06%	
Total	13	9.49%	5,665	30.35%	0.31	137	100.00%	18,667	100.00%	1.00

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	4	1.97%	17,411	19.30%	0.10	192	94.58%	81,445	90.26%	1.05
Hispanic			166	0.18%		5	2.46%	3,283	3.64%	0.68
Asian			63	0.07%		2	0.99%	522	0.58%	1.70
Native American			119	0.13%		3	1.48%	1,348	1.49%	0.99
African American			10	0.01%				169	0.19%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				88	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			282	0.31%		1	0.49%	3,375	3.74%	0.13
Total	4	1.97%	18,054	20.01%	0.10	203	100.00%	90,230	100.00%	1.00

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	1.82%	28,316	16.66%	0.11	52	94.55%	143,917	84.65%	1.12
Hispanic			352	0.21%		1	1.82%	12,126	7.13%	0.25
Asian			137	0.08%				1,375	0.81%	
Native American			114	0.07%		1	1.82%	1,768	1.04%	1.75
African American			26	0.02%		1	1.82%	693	0.41%	4.46
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				298	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			380	0.22%				9,832	5.78%	
Total	1	1.82%	29,343	17.26%	0.11	55	100.00%	170,009	100.00%	1.00

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	117	14.20%	15,849	23.22%	0.61	600	72.82%	30,207	44.25%	1.65
Hispanic	3	0.36%	1,330	1.95%	0.19	18	2.18%	1,669	2.44%	0.89
Asian			114	0.17%		4	0.49%	209	0.31%	1.59
Native American	3	0.36%	242	0.35%	1.03	13	1.58%	504	0.74%	2.14
African American	3	0.36%	66	0.10%	3.77	4	0.49%	105	0.15%	3.16
Hawaiian/Pac Is			27	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.12%	1,174	1.72%	0.07	11	1.33%	1,265	1.85%	0.72
Total	127	15.41%	18,802	27.54%	0.56	650	78.88%	33,997	49.80%	1.58

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			13,305	21.91%		431	84.18%	26,059	42.91%	1.96
Hispanic			2,177	3.58%		18	3.52%	2,621	4.32%	0.81
Asian			131	0.22%		2	0.39%	262	0.43%	0.91
Native American			986	1.62%		32	6.25%	1,230	2.03%	3.09
African American			124	0.20%		4	0.78%	191	0.31%	2.48
Hawaiian/Pac Is			25	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			1,899	3.13%		3	0.59%	1,999	3.29%	0.18
Total		0.00%	18,647	30.70%		490	95.70%	32,400	53.35%	1.79

Lane Valley dba LaneCare -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	18	3.60%	63,976	21.47%	0.17	438	87.60%	149,310	50.11%	1.75
Hispanic			5,638	1.89%		12	2.40%	8,867	2.98%	0.81
Asian			1,154	0.39%		1	0.20%	4,418	1.48%	0.13
Native American			1,137	0.38%		5	1.00%	1,994	0.67%	1.49
African American	1	0.20%	753	0.25%	0.79	12	2.40%	1,486	0.50%	4.81
Hawaiian/Pac Is			166	0.06%				369	0.12%	
Other/Unknown			6,628	2.22%		9	1.80%	8,729	2.93%	0.61
Total	19	3.80%	79,452	26.67%	0.14	477	95.40%	175,173	58.79%	1.62

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	43	5.22%	14,874	21.79%	0.24	760	92.23%	60,930	89.25%	1.03
Hispanic	1	0.12%	230	0.34%	0.36	22	2.67%	3,229	4.73%	0.56
Asian			68	0.10%		4	0.49%	391	0.57%	0.85
Native American			78	0.11%		16	1.94%	824	1.21%	1.61
African American			17	0.02%		7	0.85%	188	0.28%	3.08
Hawaiian/Pac Is			5	0.01%				70	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	3	0.36%	195	0.29%	1.27	15	1.82%	2,634	3.86%	0.47
Total	47	5.70%	15,467	22.66%	0.25	824	100.00%	68,266	100.00%	1.00

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	21	4.10%	9,034	14.88%	0.28	452	88.28%	48,398	79.69%	1.11
Hispanic			163	0.27%		18	3.52%	4,961	8.17%	0.43
Asian	1	0.20%	48	0.08%	2.47	3	0.59%	441	0.73%	0.81
Native American			165	0.27%		32	6.25%	2,381	3.92%	1.59
African American			54	0.09%		4	0.78%	369	0.61%	1.29
Hawaiian/Pac Is			6	0.01%				69	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			213	0.35%		3	0.59%	4,111	6.77%	0.09
Total	22	4.30%	9,683	15.94%	0.27	512	100.00%	60,730	100.00%	1.00

Lane Valley dba LaneCare -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	4	0.80%	41,846	14.04%	0.06	460	92.00%	255,132	85.63%	1.07
Hispanic			369	0.12%		12	2.40%	14,874	4.99%	0.48
Asian			272	0.09%		1	0.20%	5,844	1.96%	0.10
Native American			150	0.05%		5	1.00%	3,281	1.10%	0.91
African American			128	0.04%		13	2.60%	2,367	0.79%	3.27
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				553	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			540	0.18%		9	1.80%	15,897	5.34%	0.34
Total	4	0.80%	43,323	14.54%	0.06	500	100.00%	297,948	100.00%	1.00

Mid-Valley Behavioral Care Network -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Linn, Marion, Polk, Tillamook and Yamhill Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	455	14.37%	119,521	21.14%	0.68	2,143	67.67%	232,654	41.15%	1.64
Hispanic	96	3.03%	28,139	4.98%	0.61	225	7.10%	39,489	6.98%	1.02
Asian	8	0.25%	1,966	0.35%	0.73	28	0.88%	4,145	0.73%	1.21
Native American	19	0.60%	2,738	0.48%	1.24	51	1.61%	4,246	0.75%	2.14
African American	6	0.19%	1,175	0.21%	0.91	26	0.82%	2,442	0.43%	1.90
Hawaiian/Pac Is			491	0.09%				866	0.15%	
Other/Unknown	11	0.35%	22,956	4.06%	0.09	24	0.76%	29,065	5.14%	0.15
Total	595	18.79%	176,986	31.30%	0.60	2,497	78.84%	312,907	55.34%	1.42

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	63	14.82%	24,250	25.51%	0.58	321	75.53%	45,283	47.63%	1.59
Hispanic	3	0.71%	1,874	1.97%	0.36	9	2.12%	2,501	2.63%	0.80
Asian			230	0.24%		1	0.24%	397	0.42%	0.56
Native American	4	0.94%	401	0.42%	2.23	10	2.35%	701	0.74%	3.19
African American			131	0.14%		3	0.71%	164	0.17%	4.09
Hawaiian/Pac Is			47	0.05%				83	0.09%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.24%	1,771	1.86%	0.13	3	0.71%	2,139	2.25%	0.31
Total	71	16.71%	28,704	30.19%	0.55	347	81.65%	51,268	53.93%	1.51

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	261	13.23%	57,732	19.07%	0.69	1,331	67.46%	112,969	37.31%	1.81
Hispanic	71	3.60%	19,980	6.60%	0.55	164	8.31%	27,860	9.20%	0.90
Asian	7	0.35%	1,352	0.45%	0.79	20	1.01%	2,725	0.90%	1.13
Native American	12	0.61%	1,397	0.46%	1.32	26	1.32%	2,174	0.72%	1.84
African American	5	0.25%	794	0.26%	0.97	16	0.81%	1,545	0.51%	1.59
Hawaiian/Pac Is			356	0.12%				591	0.20%	
Other/Unknown	7	0.35%	16,332	5.39%	0.07	13	0.66%	20,927	6.91%	0.10
Total	363	18.40%	97,943	32.34%	0.57	1,570	79.57%	168,791	55.74%	1.43

Mid-Valley Behavioral Care Network -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
Linn, Marion, Polk, Tillamook and Yamhill Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	70	2.21%	71,782	12.70%	0.17	2,668	84.24%	423,957	74.98%	1.12
Hispanic	2	0.06%	1,341	0.24%	0.27	323	10.20%	68,969	12.20%	0.84
Asian			503	0.09%		36	1.14%	6,614	1.17%	0.97
Native American	2	0.06%	359	0.06%	0.99	72	2.27%	7,343	1.30%	1.75
African American			116	0.02%		32	1.01%	3,733	0.66%	1.53
Hawaiian/Pac Is			36	0.01%				1,393	0.25%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.03%	1,381	0.24%	0.13	36	1.14%	53,402	9.44%	0.12
Total	75	2.37%	75,518	13.36%	0.18	3,167	100.00%	565,411	100.00%	

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003 CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	1.65%	14,594	15.35%	0.11	391	92.00%	84,127	88.49%	1.04
Hispanic			139	0.15%		12	2.82%	4,514	4.75%	0.59
Asian			55	0.06%		1	0.24%	682	0.72%	0.33
Native American			67	0.07%		14	3.29%	1,169	1.23%	2.68
African American			13	0.01%		3	0.71%	308	0.32%	2.18
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				133	0.14%	
Other/Unknown			222	0.23%		4	0.94%	4,132	4.35%	0.22
Total	7	1.65%	15,093	15.88%	0.10	425	100.00%	95,065	100.00%	1.00

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003 CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	40	2.03%	33,787	11.16%	0.18	1,632	82.72%	204,488	67.53%	1.22
Hispanic			874	0.29%		235	11.91%	48,714	16.09%	0.74
Asian			332	0.11%		27	1.37%	4,409	1.46%	0.94
Native American			166	0.05%		38	1.93%	3,737	1.23%	1.56
African American			76	0.03%		21	1.06%	2,415	0.80%	1.33
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.01%				967	0.32%	
Other/Unknown			825	0.27%		20	1.01%	38,084	12.58%	0.08
Total	40	2.03%	36,080	11.91%	0.17	1,973	100.00%	302,814	100.00%	1.00

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	63	23.51%	13,170	21.80%	1.08	156	58.21%	26,543	43.93%	1.32
Hispanic	8	2.99%	2,261	3.74%	0.80	16	5.97%	3,090	5.11%	1.17
Asian			169	0.28%		3	1.12%	382	0.63%	1.77
Native American	2	0.75%	408	0.68%	1.11	8	2.99%	564	0.93%	3.20
African American			99	0.16%		2	0.75%	142	0.24%	3.18
Hawaiian/Pac Is			44	0.07%				98	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			1,925	3.19%		1	0.37%	2,150	3.56%	0.10
Total	73	27.24%	18,076	29.92%	0.91	186	69.40%	32,969	54.57%	1.27

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	12	9.23%	4,853	22.04%	0.42	98	75.38%	9,879	44.86%	1.68
Hispanic	1	0.77%	542	2.46%	0.31	3	2.31%	681	3.09%	0.75
Asian			32	0.15%		2	1.54%	72	0.33%	4.71
Native American			113	0.51%		1	0.77%	131	0.59%	1.29
African American			19	0.09%		2	1.54%	27	0.12%	12.55
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.08%				29	0.13%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.77%	361	1.64%	0.47	1	0.77%	449	2.04%	0.38
Total	14	10.77%	5,938	26.96%	0.40	107	82.31%	11,268	51.16%	1.61

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	56	15.09%	19,516	22.94%	0.66	237	63.88%	37,980	44.63%	1.43
Hispanic	13	3.50%	3,482	4.09%	0.86	33	8.89%	5,357	6.30%	1.41
Asian	1	0.27%	183	0.22%	1.25	2	0.54%	569	0.67%	0.81
Native American	1	0.27%	419	0.49%	0.55	6	1.62%	676	0.79%	2.04
African American	1	0.27%	132	0.16%	1.74	3	0.81%	564	0.66%	1.22
Hawaiian/Pac Is			26	0.03%				65	0.08%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.54%	2,567	3.02%	0.18	6	1.62%	3,400	4.00%	0.40
Total	74	19.95%	26,325	30.94%	0.64	287	77.36%	48,611	57.13%	1.35

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	2.61%	8,989	14.88%	0.18	226	84.33%	48,702	80.61%	1.05
Hispanic	1	0.37%	129	0.21%	1.75	25	9.33%	5,480	9.07%	1.03
Asian			46	0.08%		3	1.12%	597	0.99%	1.13
Native American	1	0.37%	66	0.11%	3.42	11	4.10%	1,038	1.72%	2.39
African American			5	0.01%		2	0.75%	246	0.41%	1.83
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				146	0.24%	
Other/Unknown			133	0.22%		1	0.37%	4,208	6.96%	0.05
Total	9	3.36%	9,372	15.51%	0.22	268	100.00%	60,417	100.00%	1.00

**Tillamook County --
 Calendar Year 2003**

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	8	6.15%	4,695	21.32%	0.29	118	90.77%	19,427	88.21%	1.03
Hispanic			21	0.10%		4	3.08%	1,244	5.65%	0.54
Asian			25	0.11%		2	1.54%	129	0.59%	2.63
Native American	1	0.77%	13	0.06%	13.03	2	1.54%	257	1.17%	1.32
African American			5	0.02%		2	1.54%	51	0.23%	6.64
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				49	0.22%	
Other/Unknown			57	0.26%		2	1.54%	867	3.94%	0.39
Total	9	6.92%	4,818	21.88%	0.32	130	100.00%	22,024	100.00%	1.00

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Crisis Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	8	2.16%	9,717	11.42%	0.19	301	81.13%	67,213	78.99%	1.03
Hispanic	1	0.27%	178	0.21%	1.29	47	12.67%	9,017	10.60%	1.20
Asian			45	0.05%		3	0.81%	797	0.94%	0.86
Native American			47	0.06%		7	1.89%	1,142	1.34%	1.41
African American			17	0.02%		4	1.08%	713	0.84%	1.29
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				98	0.12%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.27%	144	0.17%	1.59	9	2.43%	6,111	7.18%	0.34
Total	10	2.70%	10,155	11.93%	0.23	371	100.00%	85,091	100.00%	1.00

Verity Integrated Behavioral HealthCare -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
Multnomah County -- Calendar Year
2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	73	10.21%	102,734	16.17%	0.63	473	66.15%	290,264	45.68%	1.45
Hispanic	7	0.98%	17,548	2.76%	0.35	21	2.94%	31,100	4.89%	0.60
Asian	1	0.14%	9,329	1.47%	0.10	9	1.26%	21,356	3.36%	0.37
Native American	5	0.70%	1,761	0.28%	2.52	8	1.12%	4,008	0.63%	1.77
African American	22	3.08%	11,804	1.86%	1.66	55	7.69%	19,144	3.01%	2.55
Hawaiian/Pac Is			738	0.12%				1,406	0.22%	
Other/Unknown	3	0.42%	20,884	3.29%	0.13	27	3.78%	28,841	4.54%	0.83
Total	111	15.52%	164,798	25.93%	0.60	593	82.94%	396,119	62.33%	1.33

Washington County Dept of Health & Human Services --
CPMS -- Crisis Services
Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	28	5.19%	92,730	20.72%	0.25	323	59.81%	193,607	43.26%	1.38
Hispanic	1	0.19%	18,435	4.12%	0.04	45	8.33%	30,587	6.83%	1.22
Asian	2	0.37%	7,665	1.71%	0.22	11	2.04%	17,934	4.01%	0.51
Native American	1	0.19%	823	0.18%	1.01	6	1.11%	1,719	0.38%	2.89
African American	2	0.37%	1,665	0.37%	1.00	15	2.78%	3,033	0.68%	4.10
Hawaiian/Pac Is			417	0.09%				801	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			16,318	3.65%		4	0.74%	21,718	4.85%	0.15
Total	34	6.30%	138,053	30.85%	0.20	404	74.81%	269,399	60.20%	1.24

Warm Springs -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
Warm Springs (Tribal one)

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	1.28%				1	0.64%			
Hispanic						2	1.28%			
Asian										
Native American	80	51.28%				69	44.23%			
African American										
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown	1	0.64%				1	0.64%			
Total	83	53.21%		0.00%		73	46.79%		0.00%	

Verity Integrated Behavioral HealthCare -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	7	0.98%	66,019	10.39%	0.09	553	77.34%	459,017	72.23%	1.07
Hispanic			959	0.15%		28	3.92%	49,607	7.81%	0.50
Asian	1	0.14%	3,052	0.48%	0.29	11	1.54%	33,737	5.31%	0.29
Native American			298	0.05%		13	1.82%	6,067	0.95%	1.90
African American	1	0.14%	2,936	0.46%	0.30	78	10.91%	33,884	5.33%	2.05
Hawaiian/Pac Is			48	0.01%				2,192	0.34%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.28%	1,254	0.20%	1.42	32	4.48%	50,979	8.02%	0.56
Total	11	1.54%	74,566	11.73%	0.13	715	100.00%	635,483	100.00%	1.00

Washington County Dept of Health & Human Services -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	95	17.59%	37,018	8.27%	2.13	446	82.59%	323,355	72.26%	1.14
Hispanic	3	0.56%	713	0.16%	3.49	49	9.07%	49,735	11.11%	0.82
Asian	2	0.37%	1,453	0.32%	1.14	15	2.78%	27,052	6.04%	0.46
Native American			83	0.02%		7	1.30%	2,625	0.59%	2.21
African American	2	0.37%	128	0.03%	12.95	19	3.52%	4,826	1.08%	3.26
Hawaiian/Pac Is			28	0.01%				1,246	0.28%	
Other/Unknown			641	0.14%		4	0.74%	38,677	8.64%	0.09
Total	102	18.89%	40,064	8.95%	2.11	540	100.00%	447,516	100.00%	1.00

Warm Springs -- CPMS -- Crisis Services

Warm Springs (Tribal one)

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian						3	1.92%			
Hispanic						2	1.28%			
Asian										
Native American						149	95.51%			
African American										
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown						2	1.28%			
Total		0.00%		0.00%		156	100.00%		0.00%	

**Oregon Health Plan -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
 OHP**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	215	34.57%				316	50.80%			
Hispanic	15	2.41%				21	3.38%			
Asian	7	1.13%				5	0.80%			
Native American	5	0.80%				3	0.48%			
African American	13	2.09%				4	0.64%			
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown	11	1.77%				7	1.13%			
Total	266	42.77%		0.00%		356	57.23%		0.00%	

**Family Care, Inc. -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
 Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties - Calendar Year
 2003**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	133	8.46%	283,064	19.61%	0.43	1,044	66.37%	654,950	45.37%	1.46
Hispanic	13	0.83%	45,476	3.15%	0.26	76	4.83%	75,899	5.26%	0.92
Asian	3	0.19%	19,249	1.33%	0.14	23	1.46%	44,054	3.05%	0.48
Native American	7	0.45%	3,762	0.26%	1.71	20	1.27%	7,595	0.53%	2.42
African American	24	1.53%	14,291	0.99%	1.54	74	4.70%	23,487	1.63%	2.89
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1,389	0.10%				2,599	0.18%	
Other/Unknown	3	0.19%	46,333	3.21%	0.06	32	2.03%	61,515	4.26%	0.48

**Oregon Health Plan -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
 OHP**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian						531	85.37%			
Hispanic						36	5.79%			
Asian						12	1.93%			
Native American						8	1.29%			
African American						17	2.73%			
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown						18	2.89%			
Total		0.00%		0.00%		622	100.00%		0.00%	

**Family Care, Inc. -- CPMS -- Crisis Services
 Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties - Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	109	6.93%	146,308	10.14%	0.68	1,286	81.75%	1,084,322	75.12%	1.09
Hispanic	3	0.19%	2,161	0.15%	1.27	92	5.85%	123,536	8.56%	0.68
Asian	4	0.25%	5,156	0.36%	0.71	30	1.91%	68,459	4.74%	0.40
Native American			563	0.04%		27	1.72%	11,920	0.83%	2.08
African American	3	0.19%	3,158	0.22%	0.87	101	6.42%	40,936	2.84%	2.26
Hawaiian/Pac Is			92	0.01%				4,080	0.28%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.13%	2,415	0.17%	0.76	37	2.35%	110,263	7.64%	0.31
Total	121	7.69%	159,853	11.07%	0.69	1,573	100.00%	1,443,516	100.00%	1.00

Statewide Comparable Access Ratios - Outpatient - by MHO by County

Statewide -- Client Processing and Monitoring System -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	19,951	26.62%	686,301	20.88%	1.28	37,991	50.70%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.13
Hispanic	2,757	3.68%	107,775	3.28%	1.12	2,040	2.72%	161,577	4.92%	0.55
Asian	283	0.38%	24,712	0.75%	0.50	1,164	1.55%	58,993	1.79%	0.87
Native American	994	1.33%	14,480	0.44%	3.01	1,141	1.52%	23,870	0.73%	2.10
African American	1,783	2.38%	17,437	0.53%	4.49	1,845	2.46%	30,070	0.91%	2.69
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	653	0.87%	101,112	3.08%	0.28	872	1.16%	128,882	3.92%	0.30
Total	26,421	35.26%	954,301	29.03%	1.21	45,053	60.12%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.05

Accountable Behavioral Health Alliance -- CPMS -- Outpatient

Benton, Lincoln, Crook, Deschutes and Jefferson Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1,655	28.84%	56,711	22.17%	1.30	3,042	53.01%	124,628	48.72%	1.09
Hispanic	147	2.56%	5,673	2.22%	1.15	131	2.28%	8,508	3.33%	0.69
Asian	12	0.21%	923	0.36%	0.58	25	0.44%	3,314	1.30%	0.34
Native American	102	1.78%	2,263	0.88%	2.01	125	2.18%	3,059	1.20%	1.82
African American	40	0.70%	323	0.13%	5.52	24	0.42%	678	0.27%	1.58
Hawaiian/Pac Is			92	0.04%				256	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	30	0.52%	5,230	2.04%	0.26	26	0.45%	6,821	2.67%	0.17
Total	1,986	34.61%	71,215	27.84%	1.24	3,373	58.77%	147,264	57.57%	1.02

Benton County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	395	34.17%	14,530	19.82%	1.72	560	48.44%	39,395	53.73%	0.90
Hispanic	43	3.72%	1,190	1.62%	2.29	59	5.10%	2,394	3.26%	1.56
Asian	4	0.35%	565	0.77%	0.45	9	0.78%	2,577	3.51%	0.22
Native American	6	0.52%	163	0.22%	2.33	15	1.30%	382	0.52%	2.49
African American	12	1.04%	165	0.23%	4.61	10	0.87%	457	0.62%	1.39
Hawaiian/Pac Is			34	0.05%				142	0.19%	
Other/Unknown	17	1.47%	1,201	1.64%	0.90	5	0.43%	2,043	2.79%	0.16
Total	477	41.26%	17,848	24.34%	1.70	658	56.92%	47,390	64.63%	0.88

Statewide -- Client Processing and Monitoring System -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2,915	3.89%	418,294	12.73%	0.31	60,857	81.21%	2,584,969	78.64%	1.03
Hispanic	56	0.07%	5,962	0.18%	0.41	4,853	6.48%	275,314	8.38%	0.77
Asian	251	0.33%	6,981	0.21%	1.58	1,698	2.27%	90,686	2.76%	0.82
Native American	28	0.04%	2,254	0.07%	0.54	2,163	2.89%	40,604	1.24%	2.34
African American	65	0.09%	3,616	0.11%	0.79	3,693	4.93%	51,123	1.56%	3.17
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown	145	0.19%	6,797	0.21%	0.94	1,670	2.23%	236,791	7.20%	0.31
Total	3,460	4.62%	444,133	13.51%	0.34	74,934	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Accountable Behavioral Health Alliance -- CPMS -- Outpatient

Benton, Lincoln, Crook, Deschutes and Jefferson Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	372	6.48%	35,983	14.07%	0.46	5,069	88.33%	217,322	84.96%	1.04
Hispanic	3	0.05%	341	0.13%	0.39	281	4.90%	14,522	5.68%	0.86
Asian			243	0.09%		37	0.64%	4,480	1.75%	0.37
Native American	5	0.09%	296	0.12%	0.75	232	4.04%	5,618	2.20%	1.84
African American			23	0.01%		64	1.12%	1,024	0.40%	2.79
Hawaiian/Pac Is			17	0.01%				365	0.14%	
Other/Unknown			420	0.16%		56	0.98%	12,471	4.88%	0.20
Total	380	6.62%	37,323	14.59%	0.45	5,739	100.00%	255,802	100.00%	

Benton County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	21	1.82%	7,750	10.57%	0.17	976	84.43%	61,675	84.11%	1.00
Hispanic			61	0.08%		102	8.82%	3,645	4.97%	1.77
Asian			145	0.20%		13	1.12%	3,287	4.48%	0.25
Native American			25	0.03%		21	1.82%	570	0.78%	2.34
African American			12	0.02%		22	1.90%	634	0.86%	2.20
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				180	0.25%	
Other/Unknown			90	0.12%		22	1.90%	3,334	4.55%	0.42
Total	21	1.82%	8,087	11.03%	0.16	1,156	100.00%	73,325	100.00%	1.00

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	396	25.61%	8,008	20.11%	1.27	927	59.96%	17,463	43.85%	1.37
Hispanic	35	2.26%	777	1.95%	1.16	13	0.84%	1,276	3.20%	0.26
Asian	2	0.13%	112	0.28%	0.46	10	0.65%	182	0.46%	1.42
Native American	43	2.78%	504	1.27%	2.20	54	3.49%	678	1.70%	2.05
African American	12	0.78%	45	0.11%	6.87	3	0.19%	76	0.19%	1.02
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.05%				43	0.11%	
Other/Unknown	7	0.45%	848	2.13%	0.21	9	0.58%	1,041	2.61%	0.22
Total	495	32.02%	10,312	25.89%	1.24	1,016	65.72%	20,759	52.13%	1.26

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	175	31.70%	4,575	25.67%	1.24	333	60.33%	8,144	45.69%	1.32
Hispanic	9	1.63%	481	2.70%	0.60	8	1.45%	579	3.25%	0.45
Asian	1	0.18%	28	0.16%	1.15			41	0.23%	
Native American	5	0.91%	70	0.39%	2.31	3	0.54%	133	0.75%	0.73
African American			1	0.01%		3	0.54%	6	0.03%	16.14
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				1	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			423	2.37%		2	0.36%	499	2.80%	0.13
Total	190	34.42%	5,581	31.31%	1.10	349	63.22%	9,403	52.75%	1.20

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	569	28.28%	26,394	25.21%	1.12	1,015	50.45%	53,729	51.32%	0.98
Hispanic	28	1.39%	1,709	1.63%	0.85	19	0.94%	2,456	2.35%	0.40
Asian	5	0.25%	205	0.20%	1.27	3	0.15%	488	0.47%	0.32
Native American	13	0.65%	292	0.28%	2.32	19	0.94%	487	0.47%	2.03
African American	16	0.80%	94	0.09%	8.86	7	0.35%	116	0.11%	3.14
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.02%				50	0.05%	
Other/Unknown	5	0.25%	1,580	1.51%	0.16	9	0.45%	1,840	1.76%	0.25
Total	636	31.61%	30,292	28.94%	1.09	1,072	53.28%	59,166	56.52%	0.94

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	34	2.20%	8,463	21.25%	0.10	1,357	87.77%	33,934	85.21%	1.03
Hispanic			66	0.17%		48	3.10%	2,119	5.32%	0.58
Asian			40	0.10%		12	0.78%	334	0.84%	0.93
Native American	1	0.06%	66	0.17%	0.39	98	6.34%	1,248	3.13%	2.02
African American			1	0.00%		15	0.97%	122	0.31%	3.17
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				65	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			112	0.28%		16	1.03%	2,001	5.02%	0.21
Total	35	2.26%	8,752	21.98%	0.10	1,546	100.00%	39,823	100.00%	1.00

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	13	2.36%	2,772	15.55%	0.15	521	94.38%	15,491	86.91%	1.09
Hispanic			22	0.12%		17	3.08%	1,082	6.07%	0.51
Asian			3	0.02%		1	0.18%	72	0.40%	0.45
Native American			15	0.08%		8	1.45%	218	1.22%	1.18
African American						3	0.54%	7	0.04%	13.84
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.15%		2	0.36%	948	5.32%	0.07
Total	13	2.36%	2,840	15.93%	0.15	552	100.00%	17,824	100.00%	1.00

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	297	14.76%	14,825	14.16%	1.04	1,881	93.49%	94,948	90.70%	1.03
Hispanic	3	0.15%	139	0.13%	1.12	50	2.49%	4,304	4.11%	0.60
Asian			49	0.05%		8	0.40%	742	0.71%	0.56
Native American	4	0.20%	59	0.06%	3.53	36	1.79%	838	0.80%	2.24
African American			4	0.00%		23	1.14%	214	0.20%	5.59
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				75	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			145	0.14%		14	0.70%	3,565	3.41%	0.20
Total	304	15.11%	15,228	14.55%	1.04	2,012	100.00%	104,686	100.00%	1.00

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	120	25.37%	3,204	15.91%	1.60	207	43.76%	5,897	29.27%	1.49
Hispanic	32	6.77%	1,516	7.53%	0.90	32	6.77%	1,803	8.95%	0.76
Asian			13	0.06%		3	0.63%	26	0.13%	4.91
Native American	35	7.40%	1,234	6.13%	1.21	34	7.19%	1,379	6.85%	1.05
African American			18	0.09%		1	0.21%	23	0.11%	1.85
Hawaiian/Pac Is			19	0.09%				20	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.21%	1,178	5.85%	0.04	1	0.21%	1,398	6.94%	0.03
Total	188	39.75%	7,182	35.65%	1.11	278	58.77%	10,546	52.35%	1.12

Clackamas County Mental Health -- CPMS -- Outpatient

Clackamas, (includes Family Care Services) Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco Counties -- CY2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1,454	29.03%	87,600	24.30%	1.19	2,772	55.34%	171,079	47.45%	1.17
Hispanic	133	2.66%	9,493	2.63%	1.01	118	2.36%	14,212	3.94%	0.60
Asian	15	0.30%	2,255	0.63%	0.48	40	0.80%	4,764	1.32%	0.60
Native American	44	0.88%	1,178	0.33%	2.69	51	1.02%	1,868	0.52%	1.97
African American	73	1.46%	822	0.23%	6.39	42	0.84%	1,310	0.36%	2.31
Hawaiian/Pac Is			234	0.06%				392	0.11%	
Other/Unknown	17	0.34%	9,131	2.53%	0.13	10	0.20%	10,956	3.04%	0.07
Total	1,736	34.66%	110,713	30.71%	1.13	3,033	60.55%	204,581	56.75%	1.07

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1,142	28.61%	77,943	25.09%	1.14	2,252	56.41%	152,535	49.10%	1.15
Hispanic	92	2.30%	6,340	2.04%	1.13	87	2.18%	10,049	3.23%	0.67
Asian	12	0.30%	2,157	0.69%	0.43	39	0.98%	4,536	1.46%	0.67
Native American	35	0.88%	719	0.23%	3.79	38	0.95%	1,324	0.43%	2.23
African American	68	1.70%	758	0.24%	6.98	37	0.93%	1,205	0.39%	2.39
Hawaiian/Pac Is			180	0.06%				316	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	17	0.43%	6,763	2.18%	0.20	9	0.23%	8,053	2.59%	0.09
Total	1,366	34.22%	94,860	30.53%	1.12	2,462	61.67%	178,018	57.30%	1.08

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	1.48%	2,173	10.79%	0.14	334	70.61%	11,274	55.97%	1.26
Hispanic			53	0.26%		64	13.53%	3,372	16.74%	0.81
Asian			6	0.03%		3	0.63%	45	0.22%	2.84
Native American			131	0.65%		69	14.59%	2,744	13.62%	1.07
African American			6	0.03%		1	0.21%	47	0.23%	0.91
Hawaiian/Pac Is								39	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			47	0.23%		2	0.42%	2,623	13.02%	0.03
Total	7	1.48%	2,416	11.99%	0.12	473	100.00%	20,144	100.00%	1.00

Clackamas County Mental Health -- CPMS -- Outpatient

Clackamas, (includes Family Care Services) Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco Counties -- CY2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	234	4.67%	43,271	12.00%	0.39	4,460	89.04%	301,950	83.75%	1.06
Hispanic	3	0.06%	489	0.14%	0.44	254	5.07%	24,194	6.71%	0.76
Asian	1	0.02%	651	0.18%	0.11	56	1.12%	7,670	2.13%	0.53
Native American			182	0.05%		95	1.90%	3,228	0.90%	2.12
African American	2	0.04%	94	0.03%	1.53	117	2.34%	2,226	0.62%	3.78
Hawaiian/Pac Is			16	0.00%				642	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			520	0.14%		27	0.54%	20,607	5.72%	0.09
Total	240	4.79%	45,223	12.54%	0.38	5,009	100.00%	360,517	100.00%	

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	160	4.01%	36,295	11.68%	0.34	3,554	89.03%	266,773	85.87%	1.04
Hispanic	3	0.08%	355	0.11%	0.66	182	4.56%	16,744	5.39%	0.85
Asian	1	0.03%	540	0.17%	0.14	52	1.30%	7,233	2.33%	0.56
Native American			114	0.04%		73	1.83%	2,157	0.69%	2.63
African American			81	0.03%		105	2.63%	2,044	0.66%	4.00
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.00%				509	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			385	0.12%		26	0.65%	15,201	4.89%	0.13
Total	164	4.11%	37,783	12.16%	0.34	3,992	100.00%	310,661	100.00%	1.00

**Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- CY2003**

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	312	30.68%	9,657	19.37%	1.58	520	51.13%	18,544	37.20%	1.37
Hispanic	41	4.03%	3,153	6.32%	0.64	31	3.05%	4,163	8.35%	0.37
Asian	3	0.29%	98	0.20%	1.50	1	0.10%	228	0.46%	0.22
Native American	9	0.88%	459	0.92%	0.96	13	1.28%	544	1.09%	1.17
African American	5	0.49%	64	0.13%	3.83	5	0.49%	105	0.21%	2.33
Hawaiian/Pac Is			54	0.11%				76	0.15%	
Other/Unknown			2,368	4.75%		1	0.10%	2,903	5.82%	0.02
Total	370	36.38%	15,853	31.80%	1.14	571	56.15%	26,563	53.28%	1.05

Greater Oregon Behavioral Health, Inc -- CPMS -- Outpatient

**Baker, Grant, Harney, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa,
 Wheeler, Clatsop and Columbia Counties - Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1,610	28.74%	57,757	22.18%	1.30	3,099	55.32%	110,272	42.34%	1.31
Hispanic	198	3.53%	11,653	4.47%	0.79	134	2.39%	14,600	5.61%	0.43
Asian	9	0.16%	486	0.19%	0.86	27	0.48%	1,076	0.41%	1.17
Native American	52	0.93%	1,642	0.63%	1.47	64	1.14%	2,466	0.95%	1.21
African American	33	0.59%	335	0.13%	4.58	21	0.37%	1,034	0.40%	0.94
Hawaiian/Pac Is			138	0.05%				257	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	12	0.21%	9,762	3.75%	0.06	17	0.30%	11,218	4.31%	0.07
Total	1,914	34.17%	81,773	31.40%	1.09	3,362	60.01%	140,923	54.11%	1.11

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	231	35.05%	3,807	25.61%	1.37	371	56.30%	6,893	46.37%	1.21
Hispanic	5	0.76%	158	1.06%	0.71	8	1.21%	214	1.44%	0.84
Asian	1	0.15%	10	0.07%	2.26	1	0%	31	0.21%	0.73
Native American	6	0.91%	63	0.42%	2.15	8	1%	84	0.57%	2.15
African American	2	0.30%	9	0.06%	5.01	1	0%	25	0.17%	0.90
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				2	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			162	1.09%				200	1.35%	
Total	245	37.18%	4,212	28.33%	1.31	389	59.03%	7,449	50.11%	1.18

**Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- CY2003**

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	74	7.28%	6,976	13.99%	0.52	906	89.09%	35,177	70.56%	1.26
Hispanic			134	0.27%		72	7.08%	7,450	14.94%	0.47
Asian			111	0.22%		4	0.39%	437	0.88%	0.45
Native American			68	0.14%		22	2.16%	1,071	2.15%	1.01
African American	2	0.20%	13	0.03%	7.54	12	1.18%	182	0.37%	3.23
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				133	0.27%	
Other/Unknown			135	0.27%		1	0.10%	5,406	10.84%	0.01
Total	76	7.47%	7,440	14.92%	0.50	1,017	100.00%	49,856	100.00%	1.00

Greater Oregon Behavioral Health, Inc -- CPMS -- Outpatient

**Baker, Grant, Harney, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa,
 Wheeler, Clatsop and Columbia Counties - Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	316	5.64%	35,659	13.69%	0.41	5,025	89.70%	203,688	78.21%	1.15
Hispanic	2	0.04%	667	0.26%	0.14	334	5.96%	26,920	10.34%	0.58
Asian	1	0.02%	402	0.15%	0.12	37	0.66%	1,964	0.75%	0.88
Native American	6	0.11%	267	0.10%	1.04	122	2.18%	4,375	1.68%	1.30
African American	1	0.02%	60	0.02%	0.77	55	0.98%	1,429	0.55%	1.79
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				413	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			676	0.26%		29	0.52%	21,656	8.31%	0.06
Total	326	5.82%	37,749	14.49%	0.40	5,602	100.00%	260,445	100.00%	

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	25	3.79%	3,135	21.09%	0.18	627	95.14%	13,835	93.06%	1.02
Hispanic			20	0.13%		13	1.97%	392	2.64%	0.75
Asian			10	0.07%		2	0.30%	51	0.34%	0.88
Native American			12	0.08%		14	2.12%	159	1.07%	1.99
African American			2	0.01%		3	0.46%	36	0.24%	1.88
Hawaiian/Pac Is								5	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.17%				388	2.61%	
Total	25	3.79%	3,205	21.56%	0.18	659	100.00%	14,866	100.00%	1.00

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	301	26.17%	7,613	23.48%	1.11	712	61.91%	15,592	48.08%	1.29
Hispanic	19	1.65%	599	1.85%	0.89	12	1.04%	966	2.98%	0.35
Asian	2	0.17%	96	0.30%	0.59	6	0.52%	209	0.64%	0.81
Native American	5	0.43%	116	0.36%	1.22	6	0.52%	189	0.58%	0.90
African American	7	0.61%	52	0.16%	3.80	6	0.52%	124	0.38%	1.36
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.06%				31	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	3	0.26%	537	1.66%	0.16	6	0.52%	706	2.18%	0.24
Total	337	29.30%	9,033	27.86%	1.05	748	65.04%	17,817	54.94%	1.18

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	143	26.38%	10,965	28.01%	0.94	334	61.62%	19,954	50.98%	1.21
Hispanic	8	1.48%	500	1.28%	1.16	9	1.66%	563	1.44%	1.15
Asian	3	0.55%	68	0.17%	3.19	7	1.29%	117	0.30%	4.32
Native American	3	0.55%	176	0.45%	1.23	5	0.92%	299	0.76%	1.21
African American	2	0.37%	41	0.10%	3.52	1	0.18%	47	0.12%	1.54
Hawaiian/Pac Is			10	0.03%				26	0.07%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.18%	642	1.64%	0.11	1	0.18%	642	1.64%	0.11
Total	160	29.52%	12,402	31.68%	0.93	357	65.87%	21,648	55.30%	1.19

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	91	34.60%	1,922	27.34%	1.27	145	55.13%	3,335	47.44%	1.16
Hispanic	5	1.90%	64	0.91%	2.09	4	1.52%	93	1.32%	1.15
Asian			3	0.04%				10	0.14%	
Native American	3	1.14%	52	0.74%	1.54	5	1.90%	52	0.74%	2.57
African American			3	0.04%		1	0.38%	3	0.04%	8.91
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.38%	65	0.92%	0.41	1	0.38%	90	1.28%	0.30
Total	100	38.02%	2,109	30.00%	1.27	156	59.32%	3,585	51.00%	1.16

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	64	5.57%	5,396	16.64%	0.33	1,077	93.65%	28,601	88.20%	1.06
Hispanic			32	0.10%		31	2.70%	1,597	4.92%	0.55
Asian			56	0.17%		8	0.70%	361	1.11%	0.62
Native American	1	0.09%	22	0.07%	1.28	12	1.04%	327	1.01%	1.03
African American			5	0.02%		13	1.13%	181	0.56%	2.03
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				54	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			63	0.19%		9	0.78%	1,306	4.03%	0.19
Total	65	5.65%	557	17.20%	0.33	1,150	100.00%	32,427	100.00%	1.00

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	25	4.61%	4,932	12.60%	0.37	502	92.62%	35,851	91.59%	1.01
Hispanic			30	0.08%		17	3.14%	1,093	2.79%	1.12
Asian			22	0.06%		10	1.85%	207	0.53%	3.49
Native American			37	0.09%		8	1.48%	512	1.31%	1.13
African American			9	0.02%		3	0.55%	97	0.25%	2.23
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				38	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			61	0.16%		2	0.37%	1,345	3.44%	0.11
Total	25	4.61%	5,093	13.01%	0.35	542	100.00%	39,143	100.00%	1.00

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	2.66%	1,308	18.61%	0.14	243	92.40%	6,565	93.39%	0.99
Hispanic			6	0.09%		9	3.42%	163	2.32%	1.48
Asian								13	0.18%	
Native American			7	0.10%		8	3.04%	111	1.58%	1.93
African American						1	0.38%	6	0.09%	4.46
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			15	0.21%		2	0.76%	170	2.42%	0.31
Total	7	2.66%	1,336	19.00%	0.14	263	100.00%	7,030	100.00%	1.00

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	65	36.31%	1,754	25.22%	1.44	90	50.28%	3,229	46.42%	1.08
Hispanic	5	2.79%	143	2.06%	1.36	3	1.68%	167	2.40%	0.70
Asian			5	0.07%		1	0.56%	23	0.33%	1.69
Native American	3	1.68%	100	1.44%	1.17	2	1.12%	157	2.26%	0.50
African American	1	0.56%	4	0.06%	9.72	1	0.56%	5	0.07%	7.77
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.04%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.56%	112	1.61%	0.35	1	0.56%	113	1.62%	0.34
Total	75	41.90%	2,118	30.45%	1.38	98	54.75%	3,697	53.15%	1.03

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	32	31.37%	1,579	23.21%	1.35	61	59.80%	2,915	42.84%	1.40
Hispanic			172	2.53%		2	1.96%	221	3.25%	0.60
Asian			19	0.28%				23	0.34%	
Native American			74	1.09%		3	2.94%	86	1.26%	2.33
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								6	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			171	2.51%		1	0.98%	204	3.00%	0.33
Total	32	31.37%	2,019	29.67%	1.06	67	65.69%	3,460	50.85%	1.29

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	133	22.93%	5,778	15.78%	1.45	261	45.00%	11,633	31.77%	1.42
Hispanic	85	14.66%	3,501	9.56%	1.53	42	7.24%	4,329	11.82%	0.61
Asian	2	0.34%	79	0.22%	1.60	3	0.52%	215	0.59%	0.88
Native American	5	0.86%	97	0.26%	3.25	11	1.90%	186	0.51%	3.73
African American	5	0.86%	43	0.12%	7.34	4	0.69%	332	0.91%	0.76
Hawaiian/Pac Is			9	0.02%				10	0.03%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.34%	2,728	7.45%	0.05	1	0.17%	3,088	8.43%	0.02
Total	232	40.00%	12,235	33.41%	1.20	322	55.52%	19,793	54.05%	1.03

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	6	3.35%	1,106	15.90%	0.21	161	89.94%	6,089	87.54%	1.03
Hispanic			6	0.09%		8	4.47%	316	4.54%	0.98
Asian			7	0.10%		1	0.56%	35	0.50%	1.11
Native American			19	0.27%		5	2.79%	276	3.97%	0.70
African American			1	0.01%		2	1.12%	10	0.14%	7.77
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.03%				5	0.07%	
Other/Unknown						2	1.12%	225	3.23%	0.35
Total	6	3.35%	1,141	16.40%	0.20	179	100.00%	6,956	100.00%	1.00

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	2.94%	1,288	18.93%	0.16	96	94.12%	5,782	84.98%	1.11
Hispanic			11	0.16%		2	1.96%	404	5.94%	0.33
Asian			4	0.06%				46	0.68%	
Native American			4	0.06%		3	2.94%	164	2.41%	1.22
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.15%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.04%				9	0.13%	
Other/Unknown			14	0.21%		1	0.98%	389	5.72%	0.17
Total	3	2.94%	1,325	19.47%	0.15	102	100.00%	6,804	100.00%	1.00

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	25	4.31%	3,872	10.57%	0.41	419	72.24%	21,283	58.12%	1.24
Hispanic			269	0.73%		127	21.90%	8,099	22.12%	0.99
Asian	1	0.17%	249	0.68%	0.25	6	1.03%	543	1.48%	0.70
Native American			13	0.04%		16	2.76%	296	0.81%	3.41
African American			9	0.02%		9	1.55%	384	1.05%	1.48
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				22	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			175	0.48%		3	0.52%	5,991	16.36%	0.03
Total	26	4.48%	4,590	12.53%	0.36	580	100.00%	36,618	100.00%	1.00

**Morrow and Wheeler Counties -- CY
 2003**

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	49	27.84%	2,525	18.20%	1.53	83	47.16%	4,524	32.61%	1.45
Hispanic	16	9.09%	1,263	9.11%	1.00	14	7.95%	1,460	10.53%	0.76
Asian	1	0.57%	15	0.11%	5.25	1	0.57%	22	0.16%	3.58
Native American	2	1.14%	65	0.47%	2.43	1	0.57%	85	0.61%	0.93
African American	3	1.70%	7	0.05%	33.78			8	0.06%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.03%				5	0.04%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.57%	1,120	8.07%	0.07	1	0.57%	1,197	8.63%	0.07
Total	72	40.91%	4,999	36.04%	1.14	100	56.82%	7,301	52.63%	1.08

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	296	26.38%	14,567	19.59%	1.35	599	53.39%	28,205	37.93%	1.41
Hispanic	46	4.10%	4,949	6.66%	0.62	37	3.30%	6,185	8.32%	0.40
Asian			140	0.19%		4	0.36%	284	0.38%	0.93
Native American	23	2.05%	821	1.10%	1.86	15	1.34%	1,182	1.59%	0.84
African American	9	0.80%	136	0.18%	4.39	6	0.53%	409	0.55%	0.97
Hawaiian/Pac Is			46	0.06%				69	0.09%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.18%	3,882	5.22%	0.03	3	0.27%	4,570	6.15%	0.04
Total	376	33.51%	24,541	33.00%	1.02	664	59.18%	40,904	55.01%	1.08

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	213	34.63%	5,591	25.33%	1.37	311	50.57%	11,046	50.05%	1.01
Hispanic	5	0.81%	239	1.08%	0.75	2	0.33%	346	1.57%	0.21
Asian			49	0.22%		3	0.49%	136	0.62%	0.79
Native American			61	0.28%		4	0.65%	119	0.54%	1.21
African American	4	0.65%	36	0.16%	3.99			74	0.34%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			45	0.20%				101	0.46%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.16%	264	1.20%	0.14	2	0.33%	335	1.52%	0.21
Total	223	36.26%	6,285	28.47%	1.27	322	52.36%	12,157	55.08%	0.95

Morrow and Wheeler Counties -- CY 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	4	2.27%	1,475	10.63%	0.21	136	77.27%	8,524	61.45%	1.26
Hispanic			42	0.30%		30	17.05%	2,765	19.93%	0.86
Asian			6	0.04%		2	1.14%	43	0.31%	3.67
Native American			4	0.03%		3	1.70%	154	1.11%	1.54
African American			1	0.01%		3	1.70%	16	0.12%	14.78
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.01%				10	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			42	0.30%		2	1.14%	2,359	17.01%	0.07
Total	4	2.27%	1,571	11.33%	0.20	176	100.00%	13,871	100.00%	1.00

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	79	7.04%	8,260	11.11%	0.63	974	86.81%	51,032	68.63%	1.26
Hispanic	1	0.09%	232	0.31%	0.29	84	7.49%	11,366	15.29%	0.49
Asian			38	0.05%		4	0.36%	462	0.62%	0.57
Native American	2	0.18%	137	0.18%	0.97	40	3.57%	2,140	2.88%	1.24
African American			24	0.03%		15	1.34%	569	0.77%	1.75
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.00%				117	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			220	0.30%		5	0.45%	8,672	11.66%	0.04
Total	82	7.31%	8,913	11.99%	0.61	1,122	100.00%	74,358	100.00%	1.00

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	67	10.89%	3,535	16.02%	0.68	591	96.10%	20,172	91.39%	1.05
Hispanic	1	0.16%	15	0.07%	2.39	8	1.30%	600	2.72%	0.48
Asian			8	0.04%		3	0.49%	193	0.87%	0.56
Native American	1	0.16%	10	0.05%	3.59	5	0.81%	190	0.86%	0.94
African American	1	0.16%	8	0.04%	4.49	5	0.81%	118	0.53%	1.52
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				148	0.67%	
Other/Unknown			52	0.24%		3	0.49%	651	2.95%	0.17
Total	70	11.38%	3,630	16.45%	0.69	615	100.00%	22,072	100.00%	1.00

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	56	26.17%	1,656	26.29%	1.00	132	61.68%	2,946	46.76%	1.32
Hispanic	4	1.87%	65	1.03%	1.81	1	0.47%	56	0.89%	0.53
Asian			2	0.03%		1	0.47%	6	0.10%	4.91
Native American	2	0.93%	17	0.27%	3.46	4	1.87%	27	0.43%	4.36
African American						1	0.47%	2	0.03%	14.72
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.02%				2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			79	1.25%				73	1.16%	
Total	62	28.97%	1,820	28.89%	1.00	139	64.95%	3,112	49.40%	1.31

Jefferson Behavioral Health -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services

**Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine and Klamath Counties
 Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3,258	28.28%	105,272	22.70%	1.25	6,617	57.43%	208,560	44.97%	1.28
Hispanic	268	2.33%	11,196	2.41%	0.96	212	1.84%	14,214	3.06%	0.60
Asian	16	0.14%	934	0.20%	0.69	53	0.46%	1,986	0.43%	1.07
Native American	198	1.72%	2,938	0.63%	2.71	250	2.17%	4,510	0.97%	2.23
African American	51	0.44%	560	0.12%	3.67	57	0.49%	943	0.20%	2.43
Hawaiian/Pac Is			208	0.04%				382	0.08%	
Other/Unknown	57	0.49%	10,203	2.20%	0.22	75	0.65%	11,534	2.49%	0.26
Total	3,848	33.40%	131,311	28.31%	1.18	7,264	63.04%	242,129	52.20%	1.21

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	464	27.21%	12,022	21.50%	1.27	987	57.89%	25,648	45.88%	1.26
Hispanic	32	1.88%	863	1.54%	1.22	23	1.35%	1,135	2.03%	0.66
Asian	5	0.29%	131	0.23%	1.25	4	0.23%	276	0.49%	0.48
Native American	31	1.82%	504	0.90%	2.02	56	3.28%	729	1.30%	2.52
African American	8	0.47%	70	0.13%	3.75	8	0.47%	99	0.18%	2.65
Hawaiian/Pac Is			29	0.05%				51	0.09%	
Other/Unknown	10	0.59%	1,013	1.81%	0.32	8	0.47%	1,180	2.11%	0.22
Total	550	32.26%	14,632	26.17%	1.23	1,086	63.70%	29,118	52.08%	1.22

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	11	5.14%	1,352	21.46%	0.24	199	92.99%	5,954	94.51%	0.98
Hispanic			4	0.06%		5	2.34%	125	1.98%	1.18
Asian			2	0.03%		1	0.47%	10	0.16%	2.94
Native American	2	0.93%	2	0.03%	29.44	8	3.74%	46	0.73%	5.12
African American						1	0.47%	2	0.03%	14.72
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			8	0.13%				160	2.54%	
Total	13	6.07%	1,368	21.71%	0.28	214	100.00%	6,300	100.00%	1.00

Jefferson Behavioral Health -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services

**Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine and Klamath Counties
 Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	381	3.31%	86,716	18.70%	0.18	10,256	89.01%	400,548	86.36%	1.03
Hispanic	6	0.05%	1,083	0.23%	0.22	486	4.22%	26,493	5.71%	0.74
Asian	3	0.03%	405	0.09%	0.30	72	0.62%	3,325	0.72%	0.87
Native American	7	0.06%	619	0.13%	0.46	455	3.95%	8,067	1.74%	2.27
African American	2	0.02%	131	0.03%	0.61	110	0.95%	1,634	0.35%	2.71
Hawaiian/Pac Is			48	0.01%				638	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	11	0.10%	1,365	0.29%	0.32	143	1.24%	23,102	4.98%	0.25
Total	410	3.56%	90,367	19.48%	0.18	11,522	100.00%	463,807	100.00%	

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	64	3.75%	11,610	20.77%	0.18	1,515	88.86%	49,280	88.15%	1.01
Hispanic	2	0.12%	135	0.24%	0.49	57	3.34%	2,133	3.82%	0.88
Asian			72	0.13%		9	0.53%	479	0.86%	0.62
Native American	2	0.12%	108	0.19%	0.61	89	5.22%	1,341	2.40%	2.18
African American	1	0.06%	17	0.03%	1.93	17	1.00%	186	0.33%	3.00
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.02%				93	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			200	0.36%		18	1.06%	2,393	4.28%	0.25
Total	69	4.05%	12,155	21.74%	0.19	1,705	100.00%	55,905	100.00%	1.00

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	78	21.25%	3,559	19.07%	1.11	260	70.84%	7,548	40.43%	1.75
Hispanic	3	0.82%	319	1.71%	0.48	2	0.54%	405	2.17%	0.25
Asian			35	0.19%		1	0.27%	65	0.35%	0.78
Native American	1	0.27%	155	0.83%	0.33	10	2.72%	215	1.15%	2.37
African American			5	0.03%		1	0.27%	17	0.09%	2.99
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.04%				10	0.05%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.27%	304	1.63%	0.17	1	0.27%	358	1.92%	0.14
Total	83	22.62%	4,384	23.49%	0.96	275	74.93%	8,618	46.17%	1.62

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	606	25.52%	21,936	24.31%	1.05	1,478	62.23%	42,098	46.66%	1.33
Hispanic	35	1.47%	1,349	1.50%	0.99	36	1.52%	1,768	1.96%	0.77
Asian	3	0.13%	157	0.17%	0.73	11	0.46%	302	0.33%	1.38
Native American	30	1.26%	490	0.54%	2.33	63	2.65%	739	0.82%	3.24
African American	3	0.13%	55	0.06%	2.07	7	0.29%	104	0.12%	2.56
Hawaiian/Pac Is			23	0.03%				62	0.07%	
Other/Unknown	6	0.25%	1,418	1.57%	0.16	6	0.25%	1,675	1.86%	0.14
Total	683	28.76%	25,428	28.18%	1.02	1,601	67.41%	46,748	51.81%	1.30

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	935	29.06%	38,601	22.71%	1.28	1,827	56.77%	77,000	45.29%	1.25
Hispanic	102	3.17%	5,158	3.03%	1.04	75	2.33%	6,616	3.89%	0.60
Asian	3	0.09%	366	0.22%	0.43	24	0.75%	872	0.51%	1.45
Native American	37	1.15%	561	0.33%	3.48	37	1.15%	1,093	0.64%	1.79
African American	13	0.40%	240	0.14%	2.86	16	0.50%	427	0.25%	1.98
Hawaiian/Pac Is			97	0.06%				183	0.11%	
Other/Unknown	19	0.59%	4,395	2.59%	0.23	15	0.47%	5,057	2.97%	0.16
Total	1,109	34.46%	49,418	29.07%	1.19	1,994	61.96%	91,248	53.67%	1.15

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	9	2.45%	5,471	29.31%	0.08	347	94.55%	16,578	88.81%	1.06
Hispanic			37	0.20%		5	1.36%	761	4.08%	0.33
Asian			17	0.09%		1	0.27%	117	0.63%	0.43
Native American			35	0.19%		11	3.00%	405	2.17%	1.38
African American			7	0.04%		1	0.27%	29	0.16%	1.75
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				20	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			95	0.51%		2	0.54%	757	4.06%	0.13
Total	9	2.45%	5,665	30.35%	0.08	367	100.00%	18,667	100.00%	1.00

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	83	3.49%	17,411	19.30%	0.18	2,167	91.24%	81,445	90.26%	1.01
Hispanic			166	0.18%		71	2.99%	3,283	3.64%	0.82
Asian			63	0.07%		14	0.59%	522	0.58%	1.02
Native American	2	0.08%	119	0.13%	0.64	95	4.00%	1,348	1.49%	2.68
African American			10	0.01%		10	0.42%	169	0.19%	2.25
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				88	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	6	0.25%	282	0.31%	0.81	18	0.76%	3,375	3.74%	0.20
Total	91	3.83%	18,054	20.01%	0.19	2,375	100.00%	90,230	100.00%	1.00

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	110	3.42%	28,316	16.66%	0.21	2,872	89.25%	143,917	84.65%	1.05
Hispanic	3	0.09%	352	0.21%	0.45	180	5.59%	12,126	7.13%	0.78
Asian	1	0.03%	137	0.08%	0.39	28	0.87%	1,375	0.81%	1.08
Native American	1	0.03%	114	0.07%	0.46	75	2.33%	1,768	1.04%	2.24
African American			26	0.02%		29	0.90%	693	0.41%	2.21
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				298	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			380	0.22%		34	1.06%	9,832	5.78%	0.18
Total	115	3.57%	29,343	17.26%	0.21	3,218	100.00%	170,009	100.00%	1.00

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	788	32.43%	15,849	23.22%	1.40	1,314	54.07%	30,207	44.25%	1.22
Hispanic	47	1.93%	1,330	1.95%	0.99	39	1.60%	1,669	2.44%	0.66
Asian	4	0.16%	114	0.17%	0.99	10	0.41%	209	0.31%	1.34
Native American	31	1.28%	242	0.35%	3.60	41	1.69%	504	0.74%	2.29
African American	10	0.41%	66	0.10%	4.26	11	0.45%	105	0.15%	2.94
Hawaiian/Pac Is			27	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown	12	0.49%	1,174	1.72%	0.29	37	1.52%	1,265	1.85%	0.82
Total	892	36.71%	18,802	27.54%	1.33	1,452	59.75%	33,997	49.80%	1.20

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	387	27.12%	13,305	21.91%	1.24	751	52.63%	26,059	42.91%	1.23
Hispanic	49	3.43%	2,177	3.58%	0.96	37	2.59%	2,621	4.32%	0.60
Asian	1	0.07%	131	0.22%	0.32	3	0.21%	262	0.43%	0.49
Native American	68	4.77%	986	1.62%	2.94	43	3.01%	1,230	2.03%	1.49
African American	17	1.19%	124	0.20%	5.83	14	0.98%	191	0.31%	3.12
Hawaiian/Pac Is			25	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown	9	0.63%	1,899	3.13%	0.20	8	0.56%	1,999	3.29%	0.17
Total	531	37.21%	18,647	30.70%	1.21	856	59.99%	32,400	53.35%	1.12

Lane Valley dba LaneCare -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2,302	30.85%	63,976	21.47%	1.44	4,022	53.89%	149,310	50.11%	1.08
Hispanic	175	2.34%	5,638	1.89%	1.24	101	1.35%	8,867	2.98%	0.45
Asian	28	0.38%	1,154	0.39%	0.97	32	0.43%	4,418	1.48%	0.29
Native American	79	1.06%	1,137	0.38%	2.77	99	1.33%	1,994	0.67%	1.98
African American	96	1.29%	753	0.25%	5.09	75	1.00%	1,486	0.50%	2.01
Hawaiian/Pac Is			166	0.06%				369	0.12%	
Other/Unknown	59	0.79%	6,628	2.22%	0.36	174	2.33%	8,729	2.93%	0.80
Total	2,739	36.70%	79,452	26.67%	1.38	4,503	60.34%	175,173	58.79%	1.03

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	78	3.21%	14,874	21.79%	0.15	2,180	89.71%	60,930	89.25%	1.01
Hispanic	1	0.04%	230	0.34%	0.12	87	3.58%	3,229	4.73%	0.76
Asian	1	0.04%	68	0.10%	0.41	15	0.62%	391	0.57%	1.08
Native American	1	0.04%	78	0.11%	0.36	73	3.00%	824	1.21%	2.49
African American			17	0.02%		21	0.86%	188	0.28%	3.14
Hawaiian/Pac Is			5	0.01%				70	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	5	0.21%	195	0.29%	0.72	54	2.22%	2,634	3.86%	0.58
Total	86	3.54%	15,467	22.66%	0.16	2,430	100.00%	68,266	100.00%	1.00

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	37	2.59%	9,034	14.88%	0.17	1,175	82.34%	48,398	79.69%	1.03
Hispanic			163	0.27%		86	6.03%	4,961	8.17%	0.74
Asian	1	0.07%	48	0.08%	0.89	5	0.35%	441	0.73%	0.48
Native American	1	0.07%	165	0.27%	0.26	112	7.85%	2,381	3.92%	2.00
African American	1	0.07%	54	0.09%	0.79	32	2.24%	369	0.61%	3.69
Hawaiian/Pac Is			6	0.01%				69	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			213	0.35%		17	1.19%	4,111	6.77%	0.18
Total	40	2.80%	9,683	15.94%	0.18	1,427	100.00%	60,730	100.00%	1.00

Lane Valley dba LaneCare -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	144	1.93%	41,846	14.04%	0.14	6,468	86.67%	255,132	85.63%	1.01
Hispanic	2	0.03%	369	0.12%	0.22	278	3.73%	14,874	4.99%	0.75
Asian	3	0.04%	272	0.09%	0.44	63	0.84%	5,844	1.96%	0.43
Native American			150	0.05%		178	2.39%	3,281	1.10%	2.17
African American	1	0.01%	128	0.04%	0.31	172	2.30%	2,367	0.79%	2.90
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				553	0.19%	
Other/Unknown	71	0.95%	540	0.18%	5.25	304	4.07%	15,897	5.34%	0.76
Total	221	2.96%	43,323	14.54%	0.20	7,463	100.00%	297,948	100.00%	1.00

Mid-Valley Behavioral Care Network -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Linn, Marion, Polk, Tillamook and Yamhill Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3,656	28.32%	119,521	21.14%	1.34	6,618	51.26%	232,654	41.15%	1.25
Hispanic	781	6.05%	28,139	4.98%	1.22	449	3.48%	39,489	6.98%	0.50
Asian	37	0.29%	1,966	0.35%	0.82	75	0.58%	4,145	0.73%	0.79
Native American	171	1.32%	2,738	0.48%	2.74	168	1.30%	4,246	0.75%	1.73
African American	111	0.86%	1,175	0.21%	4.14	96	0.74%	2,442	0.43%	1.72
Hawaiian/Pac Is			491	0.09%				866	0.15%	
Other/Unknown	68	0.53%	22,956	4.06%	0.13	147	1.14%	29,065	5.14%	0.22
Total	4,824	37.36%	176,986	31.30%	1.19	7,553	58.50%	312,907	55.34%	1.06

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	733	30.97%	24,250	25.51%	1.21	1,349	56.99%	45,283	47.63%	1.20
Hispanic	59	2.49%	1,874	1.97%	1.26	39	1.65%	2,501	2.63%	0.63
Asian	2	0.08%	230	0.24%	0.35	10	0.42%	397	0.42%	1.01
Native American	20	0.84%	401	0.42%	2.00	29	1.23%	701	0.74%	1.66
African American	14	0.59%	131	0.14%	4.29	12	0.51%	164	0.17%	2.94
Hawaiian/Pac Is			47	0.05%				83	0.09%	
Other/Unknown	7	0.30%	1,771	1.86%	0.16	5	0.21%	2,139	2.25%	0.09
Total	835	35.28%	28,704	30.19%	1.17	1,444	61.01%	51,268	53.93%	1.13

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1,778	25.36%	57,732	19.07%	1.33	3,530	50.36%	112,969	37.31%	1.35
Hispanic	573	8.17%	19,980	6.60%	1.24	303	4.32%	27,860	9.20%	0.47
Asian	25	0.36%	1,352	0.45%	0.80	56	0.80%	2,725	0.90%	0.89
Native American	84	1.20%	1,397	0.46%	2.60	82	1.17%	2,174	0.72%	1.63
African American	79	1.13%	794	0.26%	4.30	66	0.94%	1,545	0.51%	1.85
Hawaiian/Pac Is			356	0.12%				591	0.20%	
Other/Unknown	46	0.66%	16,332	5.39%	0.12	129	1.84%	20,927	6.91%	0.27
Total	2,585	36.88%	97,943	32.34%	1.14	4,166	59.43%	168,791	55.74%	1.07

Mid-Valley Behavioral Care Network -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
Linn, Marion, Polk, Tillamook and Yamhill Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	484	3.75%	71,782	12.70%	0.30	10,758	83.32%	423,957	74.98%	1.11
Hispanic	13	0.10%	1,341	0.24%	0.42	1,243	9.63%	68,969	12.20%	0.79
Asian	17	0.13%	503	0.09%	1.48	129	1.00%	6,614	1.17%	0.85
Native American	4	0.03%	359	0.06%	0.49	343	2.66%	7,343	1.30%	2.05
African American	3	0.02%	116	0.02%	1.13	210	1.63%	3,733	0.66%	2.46
Hawaiian/Pac Is			36	0.01%				1,393	0.25%	
Other/Unknown	13	0.10%	1,381	0.24%	0.41	228	1.77%	53,402	9.44%	0.19
Total	534	4.14%	75,518	13.36%	0.31	12,911	100.00%	565,411	100.00%	

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003 **CPMS -- Outpatient Services**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	86	3.63%	14,594	15.35%	0.24	2,168	91.59%	84,127	88.49%	1.04
Hispanic	1	0.04%	139	0.15%	0.29	99	4.18%	4,514	4.75%	0.88
Asian	1	0.04%	55	0.06%	0.73	13	0.55%	682	0.72%	0.77
Native American			67	0.07%		49	2.07%	1,169	1.23%	1.68
African American			13	0.01%		26	1.10%	308	0.32%	3.39
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				133	0.14%	
Other/Unknown			222	0.23%		12	0.51%	4,132	4.35%	0.12
Total	88	3.72%	15,093	15.88%	0.23	2,367	100.00%	95,065	100.00%	1.00

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003 **CPMS -- Outpatient Services**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	219	3.12%	33,787	11.16%	0.28	5,527	78.84%	204,488	67.53%	1.17
Hispanic	8	0.11%	874	0.29%	0.40	884	12.61%	48,714	16.09%	0.78
Asian	16	0.23%	332	0.11%	2.08	97	1.38%	4,409	1.46%	0.95
Native American	2	0.03%	166	0.05%	0.52	168	2.40%	3,737	1.23%	1.94
African American	1	0.01%	76	0.03%	0.57	146	2.08%	2,415	0.80%	2.61
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.01%				967	0.32%	
Other/Unknown	13	0.19%	825	0.27%	0.68	188	2.68%	38,084	12.58%	0.21
Total	259	3.69%	36,080	11.91%	0.31	7,010	100.00%	302,814	100.00%	1.00

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	388	34.95%	13,170	21.80%	1.60	492	44.32%	26,543	43.93%	1.01
Hispanic	61	5.50%	2,261	3.74%	1.47	19	1.71%	3,090	5.11%	0.33
Asian	4	0.36%	169	0.28%	1.29	1	0.09%	382	0.63%	0.14
Native American	20	1.80%	408	0.68%	2.67	18	1.62%	564	0.93%	1.74
African American	7	0.63%	99	0.16%	3.85	4	0.36%	142	0.24%	1.53
Hawaiian/Pac Is			44	0.07%				98	0.16%	
Other/Unknown	6	0.54%	1,925	3.19%	0.17	2	0.18%	2,150	3.56%	0.05
Total	486	43.78%	18,076	29.92%	1.46	536	48.29%	32,969	54.57%	0.88

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	215	27.42%	4,853	22.04%	1.24	473	60.33%	9,879	44.86%	1.35
Hispanic	14	1.79%	542	2.46%	0.73	10	1.28%	681	3.09%	0.41
Asian	2	0.26%	32	0.15%	1.76	2	0.26%	72	0.33%	0.78
Native American	11	1.40%	113	0.51%	2.73	15	1.91%	131	0.59%	3.22
African American	5	0.64%	19	0.09%	7.39	6	0.77%	27	0.12%	6.24
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.08%				29	0.13%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.26%	361	1.64%	0.16	2	0.26%	449	2.04%	0.13
Total	249	31.76%	5,938	26.96%	1.18	508	64.80%	11,268	51.16%	1.27

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	542	33.05%	19,516	22.94%	1.44	774	47.20%	37,980	44.63%	1.06
Hispanic	74	4.51%	3,482	4.09%	1.10	78	4.76%	5,357	6.30%	0.76
Asian	4	0.24%	183	0.22%	1.13	6	0.37%	569	0.67%	0.55
Native American	36	2.20%	419	0.49%	4.46	24	1.46%	676	0.79%	1.84
African American	6	0.37%	132	0.16%	2.36	8	0.49%	564	0.66%	0.74
Hawaiian/Pac Is			26	0.03%				65	0.08%	
Other/Unknown	7	0.43%	2,567	3.02%	0.14	9	0.55%	3,400	4.00%	0.14
Total	669	40.79%	26,325	30.94%	1.32	899	54.82%	48,611	57.13%	0.96

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	86	7.75%	8,989	14.88%	0.52	966	87.03%	48,702	80.61%	1.08
Hispanic	1	0.09%	129	0.21%	0.42	81	7.30%	5,480	9.07%	0.80
Asian			46	0.08%		5	0.45%	597	0.99%	0.46
Native American			66	0.11%		38	3.42%	1,038	1.72%	1.99
African American	1	0.09%	5	0.01%	10.89	12	1.08%	246	0.41%	2.66
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				146	0.24%	
Other/Unknown			133	0.22%		8	0.72%	4,208	6.96%	0.10
Total	88	7.93%	9,372	15.51%	0.51	1,110	100.00%	60,417	100.00%	1.00

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	25	3.19%	4,695	21.32%	0.15	713	90.94%	19,427	88.21%	1.03
Hispanic			21	0.10%		24	3.06%	1,244	5.65%	0.54
Asian			25	0.11%		4	0.51%	129	0.59%	0.87
Native American	2	0.26%	13	0.06%	4.32	28	3.57%	257	1.17%	3.06
African American			5	0.02%		11	1.40%	51	0.23%	6.06
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				49	0.22%	
Other/Unknown			57	0.26%		4	0.51%	867	3.94%	0.13
Total	27	3.44%	4,818	21.88%	0.16	784	100.00%	22,024	100.00%	1.00

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

CPMS -- Outpatient Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	68	4.15%	9,717	11.42%	0.36	1,384	84.39%	67,213	78.99%	1.07
Hispanic	3	0.18%	178	0.21%	0.87	155	9.45%	9,017	10.60%	0.89
Asian			45	0.05%		10	0.61%	797	0.94%	0.65
Native American			47	0.06%		60	3.66%	1,142	1.34%	2.73
African American	1	0.06%	17	0.02%	3.05	15	0.91%	713	0.84%	1.09
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				98	0.12%	
Other/Unknown			144	0.17%		16	0.98%	6,111	7.18%	0.14
Total	72	4.39%	10,155	11.93%	0.37	1,640	100.00%	85,091	100.00%	1.00

Verity Integrated Behavioral HealthCare -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	4,485	22.25%	102,734	16.17%	1.38	8,527	42.31%	290,264	45.68%	0.93
Hispanic	742	3.68%	17,548	2.76%	1.33	578	2.87%	31,100	4.89%	0.59
Asian	134	0.66%	9,329	1.47%	0.45	810	4.02%	21,356	3.36%	1.20
Native American	213	1.06%	1,761	0.28%	3.81	241	1.20%	4,008	0.63%	1.90
African American	1,249	6.20%	11,804	1.86%	3.34	1,377	6.83%	19,144	3.01%	2.27
Hawaiian/Pac Is			738	0.12%				1,406	0.22%	
Other/Unknown	347	1.72%	20,884	3.29%	0.52	349	1.73%	28,841	4.54%	0.38
Total	7,170	35.58%	164,798	25.93%	1.37	11,882	58.96%	396,119	62.33%	0.95

Washington County Dept of Health & Human Services
Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003 **CPMS -- Outpatient Services**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1,314	22.82%	92,730	20.72%	1.10	2,977	51.71%	193,607	43.26%	1.20
Hispanic	298	5.18%	18,435	4.12%	1.26	294	5.11%	30,587	6.83%	0.75
Asian	25	0.43%	7,665	1.71%	0.25	97	1.68%	17,934	4.01%	0.42
Native American	50	0.87%	823	0.18%	4.72	71	1.23%	1,719	0.38%	3.21
African American	117	2.03%	1,665	0.37%	5.46	149	2.59%	3,033	0.68%	3.82
Hawaiian/Pac Is			417	0.09%				801	0.18%	
Other/Unknown	51	0.89%	16,318	3.65%	0.24	66	1.15%	21,718	4.85%	0.24
Total	1,855	32.22%	138,053	30.85%	1.04	3,654	63.47%	269,399	60.20%	1.05

Warm Springs -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
Warm Springs (Tribal one)

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	1.28%				1	0.64%			
Hispanic						2	1.28%			
Asian										
Native American	80	51.28%				69	44.23%			
African American										
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown	1	0.64%				1	0.64%			
Total	83	53.21%		0.00%		73	46.79%		0.00%	

Verity Integrated Behavioral HealthCare -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	760	3.77%	66,019	10.39%	0.36	13,772	68.34%	459,017	72.23%	0.95
Hispanic	17	0.08%	959	0.15%	0.56	1,337	6.63%	49,607	7.81%	0.85
Asian	222	1.10%	3,052	0.48%	2.29	1,166	5.79%	33,737	5.31%	1.09
Native American	6	0.03%	298	0.05%	0.63	460	2.28%	6,067	0.95%	2.39
African American	54	0.27%	2,936	0.46%	0.58	2,680	13.30%	33,884	5.33%	2.49
Hawaiian/Pac Is			48	0.01%				2,192	0.34%	
Other/Unknown	42	0.21%	1,254	0.20%	1.06	738	3.66%	50,979	8.02%	0.46
Total	1,101	5.46%	74,566	11.73%	0.47	20,153	100.00%	635,483	100.00%	1.00

Washington County Dept of Health & Human Services -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003 **CPMS -- Outpatient Services**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	224	3.89%	37,018	8.27%	0.47	4,515	78.43%	323,355	72.26%	1.09
Hispanic	10	0.17%	713	0.16%	1.09	602	10.46%	49,735	11.11%	0.94
Asian	4	0.07%	1,453	0.32%	0.21	126	2.19%	27,052	6.04%	0.36
Native American			83	0.02%		121	2.10%	2,625	0.59%	3.58
African American	2	0.03%	128	0.03%	1.21	268	4.66%	4,826	1.08%	4.32
Hawaiian/Pac Is			28	0.01%				1,246	0.28%	
Other/Unknown	8	0.14%	641	0.14%	0.97	125	2.17%	38,677	8.64%	0.25
Total	248	4.31%	40,064	8.95%	0.48	5,757	100.00%	447,516	100.00%	1.00

Warm Springs -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
Warm Springs (Tribal one)

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian						3	1.92%			
Hispanic						2	1.28%			
Asian										
Native American						149	95.51%			
African American										
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown						2	1.28%			
Total		0.00%		0.00%		156	100.00%		0.00%	

**Oregon Health Plan -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
 OHP**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	215	34.57%				316	50.80%			
Hispanic	15	2.41%				21	3.38%			
Asian	7	1.13%				5	0.80%			
Native American	5	0.80%				3	0.48%			
African American	13	2.09%				4	0.64%			
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown	11	1.77%				7	1.13%			
Total	266	42.77%		0.00%		356	57.23%		0.00%	

**Family Care -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
 Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	6,941	23.21%	273,407	19.62%	1.18	13,756	46.00%	636,406	45.66%	1.01
Hispanic	1,132	3.79%	42,323	3.04%	1.25	959	3.21%	71,736	5.15%	0.62
Asian	171	0.57%	19,151	1.37%	0.42	946	3.16%	43,826	3.14%	1.01
Native American	298	1.00%	3,303	0.24%	4.20	350	1.17%	7,051	0.51%	2.31
African American	1,434	4.80%	14,227	1.02%	4.70	1,563	5.23%	23,382	1.68%	3.12
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1,335	0.10%				2,523	0.18%	
Other/Unknown	415	1.39%	43,965	3.15%	0.44	424	1.42%	58,612	4.21%	0.34
Total	10,391	34.75%	397,711	28.54%	1.22	17,998	60.19%	843,536	60.53%	0.99

**Oregon Health Plan -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
 OHP**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian						531	85.37%			
Hispanic						36	5.79%			
Asian						12	1.93%			
Native American						8	1.29%			
African American						17	2.73%			
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown						18	2.89%			
Total		0.00%		0.00%		622	100.00%		0.00%	

**Family Care -- CPMS -- Outpatient Services
 Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties Calendar Year 2003**

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1,144	3.83%	139,332	10.00%	0.38	21,841	73.04%	1,049,145	75.28%	0.97
Hispanic	30	0.10%	2,027	0.15%	0.69	2,121	7.09%	116,086	8.33%	0.85
Asian	227	0.76%	5,045	0.36%	2.10	1,344	4.49%	68,022	4.88%	0.92
Native American	6	0.02%	495	0.04%	0.56	654	2.19%	10,849	0.78%	2.81
African American	56	0.19%	3,145	0.23%	0.83	3,053	10.21%	40,754	2.92%	3.49
Hawaiian/Pac Is			89	0.01%				3,947	0.28%	
Other/Unknown	50	0.17%	2,280	0.16%	1.02	889	2.97%	104,857	7.52%	0.40
Total	1,513	5.06%	152,413	10.94%	0.46	29,902	100.00%	1,393,660	100.00%	1.00

Statewide Comparable Access Ratios - Acute Community

Statewide -- Oregon Patient / Resident Care System -- Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	243	3.69%	686,301	20.88%	0.18	4,019	61.02%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.35
Hispanic	15	0.23%	107,775	3.28%	0.07	153	2.32%	161,577	4.92%	0.47
Asian	2	0.03%	24,712	0.75%	0.04	70	1.06%	58,993	1.79%	0.59
Native American	7	0.11%	14,480	0.44%	0.24	63	0.96%	23,870	0.73%	1.32
African American	22	0.33%	17,437	0.53%	0.63	261	3.96%	30,070	0.91%	4.33
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	45	0.68%	101,112	3.08%	0.22	1,305	19.81%	128,882	3.92%	5.05
Total	334	5.07%	954,301	29.03%	0.17	5,871	89.14%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.55

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,807	25.61%		12	85.71%	6,893	46.37%	1.85
Hispanic			158	1.06%		1	7.14%	214	1.44%	4.96
Asian			10	0.07%				31	0.21%	
Native American			63	0.42%				84	0.57%	
African American			9	0.06%				25	0.17%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				2	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			162	1.09%				200	1.35%	
Total		0.00%	4,212	28.33%		13	92.86%	7,449	50.11%	1.85

Benton County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	4	5.00%	14,530	19.82%	0.25	35	43.75%	39,395	53.73%	0.81
Hispanic			1,190	1.62%		1	1.25%	2,394	3.26%	0.38
Asian			565	0.77%		1	1.25%	2,577	3.51%	0.36
Native American			163	0.22%				382	0.52%	
African American			165	0.23%		3	3.75%	457	0.62%	6.02
Hawaiian/Pac Is			34	0.05%				142	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			1,201	1.64%		32	40.00%	2,043	2.79%	14.36
Total	4	5.00%	17,848	24.34%	0.21	72	90.00%	47,390	64.63%	1.39

Statewide -- Oregon Patient / Resident Care System -- Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	236	3.58%	418,294	12.73%	0.28	4,498	68.30%	2,584,969	78.64%	0.87
Hispanic			5,962	0.18%		168	2.55%	275,314	8.38%	0.30
Asian			6,981	0.21%		72	1.09%	90,686	2.76%	0.40
Native American	3	0.05%	2,254	0.07%	0.66	73	1.11%	40,604	1.24%	0.90
African American	6	0.09%	3,616	0.11%	0.83	289	4.39%	51,123	1.56%	2.82
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown	136	2.06%	6,797	0.21%	9.99	1,486	22.56%	236,791	7.20%	3.13
Total	381	5.78%	444,133	13.51%	0.43	6,586	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	7.14%	3,135	21.09%	0.34	13	92.86%	13,835	93.06%	1.00
Hispanic			20	0.13%		1	7.14%	392	2.64%	2.71
Asian			10	0.07%				51	0.34%	
Native American			12	0.08%				159	1.07%	
African American			2	0.01%				36	0.24%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								5	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.17%				388	2.61%	
Total	1	7.14%	3,205	21.56%	0.33	14	100.00%	14,866	100.00%	1.00

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	2.50%	7,750	10.57%	0.24	41	51.25%	61,675	84.11%	0.61
Hispanic			61	0.08%		1	1.25%	3,645	4.97%	0.25
Asian			145	0.20%		1	1.25%	3,287	4.48%	0.28
Native American			25	0.03%				570	0.78%	
African American			12	0.02%		3	3.75%	634	0.86%	4.34
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				180	0.25%	
Other/Unknown	2	2.50%	90	0.12%	20.37	34	42.50%	3,334	4.55%	9.35
Total	4	5.00%	8,087	11.03%	0.45	80	100.00%	73,325	100.00%	1.00

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	14	3.13%	77,943	25.09%	0.12	345	77.18%	152,535	49.10%	1.57
Hispanic			6,340	2.04%		6	1.34%	10,049	3.23%	0.41
Asian			2,157	0.69%		2	0.45%	4,536	1.46%	0.31
Native American			719	0.23%		4	0.89%	1,324	0.43%	2.10
African American	1	0.22%	758	0.24%	0.92	6	1.34%	1,205	0.39%	3.46
Hawaiian/Pac Is			180	0.06%				316	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	7	1.57%	6,763	2.18%	0.72	39	8.72%	8,053	2.59%	3.37
Total	22	4.92%	94,860	30.53%	0.16	402	89.93%	178,018	57.30%	1.57

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			7,613	23.48%		28	84.85%	15,592	48.08%	1.76
Hispanic			599	1.85%		1	3.03%	966	2.98%	1.02
Asian			96	0.30%				209	0.64%	
Native American			116	0.36%				189	0.58%	
African American			52	0.16%				124	0.38%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.06%				31	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			537	1.66%		4	12.12%	706	2.18%	5.57
Total		0.00%	9,033	27.86%		33	100.00%	17,817	54.94%	1.82

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	5	7.69%	10,965	28.01%	0.27	44	67.69%	19,954	50.98%	1.33
Hispanic			500	1.28%		1	1.54%	563	1.44%	1.07
Asian			68	0.17%				117	0.30%	
Native American			176	0.45%		1	1.54%	299	0.76%	2.01
African American			41	0.10%				47	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			10	0.03%				26	0.07%	
Other/Unknown	1	1.54%	642	1.64%	0.94	7	10.77%	642	1.64%	6.57
Total	6	9.23%	12,402	31.68%	0.29	53	81.54%	21,648	55.30%	1.47

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	18	4.03%	36,295	11.68%	0.34	377	84.34%	266,773	85.87%	0.98
Hispanic			355	0.11%		6	1.34%	16,744	5.39%	0.25
Asian			540	0.17%		2	0.45%	7,233	2.33%	0.19
Native American			114	0.04%		4	0.89%	2,157	0.69%	1.29
African American			81	0.03%		7	1.57%	2,044	0.66%	2.38
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.00%				509	0.16%	
Other/Unknown	5	1.12%	385	0.12%	9.03	51	11.41%	15,201	4.89%	2.33
Total	23	5.15%	37,783	12.16%	0.42	447	100.00%	310,661	100.00%	1.00

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			5,396	16.64%		28	84.85%	28,601	88.20%	0.96
Hispanic			32	0.10%		1	3.03%	1,597	4.92%	0.62
Asian			56	0.17%				361	1.11%	
Native American			22	0.07%				327	1.01%	
African American			5	0.02%				181	0.56%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				54	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			63	0.19%		4	12.12%	1,306	4.03%	3.01
Total		0.00%	557	17.20%		33	100.00%	32,427	100.00%	1.00

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	5	7.69%	4,932	12.60%	0.61	54	83.08%	35,851	91.59%	0.91
Hispanic			30	0.08%		1	1.54%	1,093	2.79%	0.55
Asian			22	0.06%				207	0.53%	
Native American			37	0.09%		1	1.54%	512	1.31%	1.18
African American	1	1.54%	9	0.02%	66.91	1	1.54%	97	0.25%	6.21
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				38	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			61	0.16%		8	12.31%	1,345	3.44%	3.58
Total	6	9.23%	5,093	13.01%	0.71	65	100.00%	39,143	100.00%	1.00

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	12	8.82%	12,022	21.50%	0.41	102	75.00%	25,648	45.88%	1.63
Hispanic			863	1.54%		1	0.74%	1,135	2.03%	0.36
Asian			131	0.23%				276	0.49%	
Native American			504	0.90%		2	1.47%	729	1.30%	1.13
African American			70	0.13%				99	0.18%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			29	0.05%				51	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			1,013	1.81%		3	2.21%	1,180	2.11%	1.05
Total	12	8.82%	14,632	26.17%	0.34	108	79.41%	29,118	52.08%	1.52

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	10.00%	4,575	25.67%	0.39	8	80.00%	8,144	45.69%	1.75
Hispanic			481	2.70%				579	3.25%	
Asian			28	0.16%				41	0.23%	
Native American			70	0.39%				133	0.75%	
African American			1	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				1	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			423	2.37%		1	10.00%	499	2.80%	3.57
Total	1	10.00%	5,581	31.31%	0.32	9	90.00%	9,403	52.75%	1.71

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,559	19.07%		13	44.83%	7,548	40.43%	1.11
Hispanic			319	1.71%				405	2.17%	
Asian			35	0.19%				65	0.35%	
Native American			155	0.83%				215	1.15%	
African American			5	0.03%		1	3.45%	17	0.09%	37.86
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.04%				10	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			304	1.63%		14	48.28%	358	1.92%	25.17
Total		0.00%	4,384	23.49%		28	96.55%	8,618	46.17%	2.09

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	13	9.56%	11,610	20.77%	0.46	127	93.38%	49,280	88.15%	1.06
Hispanic			135	0.24%		1	0.74%	2,133	3.82%	0.19
Asian			72	0.13%				479	0.86%	
Native American			108	0.19%		2	1.47%	1,341	2.40%	0.61
African American	1	0.74%	17	0.03%	24.18	1	0.74%	186	0.33%	2.21
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.02%				93	0.17%	
Other/Unknown	2	1.47%	200	0.36%	4.11	5	3.68%	2,393	4.28%	0.86
Total	16	11.76%	12,155	21.74%	0.54	136	100.00%	55,905	100.00%	1.00

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			2,772	15.55%		9	90.00%	15,491	86.91%	1.04
Hispanic			22	0.12%				1,082	6.07%	
Asian			3	0.02%				72	0.40%	
Native American			15	0.08%				218	1.22%	
African American								7	0.04%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.15%		1	10.00%	948	5.32%	1.88
Total		0.00%	2,840	15.93%		10	100.00%	17,824	100.00%	1.00

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			5,471	29.31%		13	44.83%	16,578	88.81%	0.50
Hispanic			37	0.20%				761	4.08%	
Asian			17	0.09%				117	0.63%	
Native American			35	0.19%				405	2.17%	
African American			7	0.04%		1	3.45%	29	0.16%	22.20
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				20	0.11%	
Other/Unknown	1	3.45%	95	0.51%	6.78	15	51.72%	757	4.06%	12.75
Total	1	3.45%	5,665	30.35%	0.11	29	100.00%	18,667	100.00%	1.00

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	5.41%	26,394	25.21%	0.21	25	67.57%	53,729	51.32%	1.32
Hispanic			1,709	1.63%				2,456	2.35%	
Asian			205	0.20%				488	0.47%	
Native American			292	0.28%				487	0.47%	
African American			94	0.09%				116	0.11%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.02%				50	0.05%	
Other/Unknown	1	2.70%	1,580	1.51%	1.79	9	24.32%	1,840	1.76%	13.84
Total	3	8.11%	30,292	28.94%	0.28	34	91.89%	59,166	56.52%	1.63

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	90	17.01%	21,936	24.31%	0.70	375	70.89%	42,098	46.66%	1.52
Hispanic	4	0.76%	1,349	1.50%	0.51	9	1.70%	1,768	1.96%	0.87
Asian	1	0.19%	157	0.17%	1.09	1	0.19%	302	0.33%	0.56
Native American	3	0.57%	490	0.54%	1.04	5	0.95%	739	0.82%	1.15
African American	1	0.19%	55	0.06%	3.10	3	0.57%	104	0.12%	4.92
Hawaiian/Pac Is			23	0.03%				62	0.07%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.38%	1,418	1.57%	0.24	6	1.13%	1,675	1.86%	0.61
Total	101	19.09%	25,428	28.18%	0.68	399	75.43%	46,748	51.81%	1.46

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			1,922	27.34%		14	100%	3,335	47.44%	2.11
Hispanic			64	0.91%				93	1.32%	
Asian			3	0.04%				10	0.14%	
Native American			52	0.74%				52	0.74%	
African American			3	0.04%				3	0.04%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			65	0.92%				90	1.28%	
Total		0.00%	2,109	30.00%		14	100.00%	3,585	51.00%	1.96

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			14,825	14.16%		27	72.97%	94,948	90.70%	0.80
Hispanic			139	0.13%				4,304	4.11%	
Asian			49	0.05%				742	0.71%	
Native American			59	0.06%				838	0.80%	
African American			4	0.00%				214	0.20%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				75	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			145	0.14%		10	27.03%	3,565	3.41%	7.94
Total		0.00%	15,228	14.55%		37	100.00%	104,686	100.00%	1.00

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	28	5.29%	17,411	19.30%	0.27	493	93.19%	81,445	90.26%	1.03
Hispanic			166	0.18%		13	2.46%	3,283	3.64%	0.68
Asian			63	0.07%		2	0.38%	522	0.58%	0.65
Native American			119	0.13%		8	1.51%	1,348	1.49%	1.01
African American			10	0.01%		4	0.76%	169	0.19%	4.04
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				88	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.19%	282	0.31%	0.60	9	1.70%	3,375	3.74%	0.45
Total	29	5.48%	18,054	20.01%	0.27	529	100.00%	90,230	100.00%	1.00

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,308	18.61%		14	100.00%	6,565	93.39%	1.07
Hispanic			6	0.09%				163	2.32%	
Asian								13	0.18%	
Native American			7	0.10%				111	1.58%	
African American								6	0.09%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			15	0.21%				170	2.42%	
Total		0.00%	1,336	19.00%		14	100.00%	7,030	100.00%	1.00

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,754	25.22%		7	87.50%	3,229	46.42%	1.88
Hispanic			143	2.06%				167	2.40%	
Asian			5	0.07%				23	0.33%	
Native American			100	1.44%				157	2.26%	
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.04%	
Other/Unknown			112	1.61%		1	12.50%	113	1.62%	7.69
Total		0.00%	2,118	30.45%		8	100.00%	3,697	53.15%	1.88

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	10	1.47%	38,601	22.71%	0.06	143	21.03%	77,000	45.29%	0.46
Hispanic			5,158	3.03%		4	0.59%	6,616	3.89%	0.15
Asian			366	0.22%		2	0.29%	872	0.51%	0.57
Native American	1	0.15%	561	0.33%	0.45	2	0.29%	1,093	0.64%	0.46
African American	1	0.15%	240	0.14%	1.04	3	0.44%	427	0.25%	1.76
Hawaiian/Pac Is			97	0.06%				183	0.11%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.29%	4,395	2.59%	0.11	444	65.29%	5,057	2.97%	21.95
Total	14	2.06%	49,418	29.07%	0.07	598	87.94%	91,248	53.67%	1.64

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	14.29%	3,204	15.91%	0.90	3	42.86%	5,897	29.27%	1.46
Hispanic			1,516	7.53%				1,803	8.95%	
Asian			13	0.06%				26	0.13%	
Native American			1,234	6.13%		1	14.29%	1,379	6.85%	2.09
African American			18	0.09%				23	0.11%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			19	0.09%				20	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			1,178	5.85%				1,398	6.94%	
Total	1	14.29%	7,182	35.65%	0.40	4	57.14%	10,546	52.35%	1.09

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,106	15.90%		7	87.50%	6,089	87.54%	1.00
Hispanic			6	0.09%				316	4.54%	
Asian			7	0.10%				35	0.50%	
Native American			19	0.27%				276	3.97%	
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.14%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.03%				5	0.07%	
Other/Unknown						1	12.50%	225	3.23%	3.86
Total		0.00%	1,141	16.40%		8	100.00%	6,956	100.00%	1.00

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	1.03%	28,316	16.66%	0.06	160	23.53%	143,917	84.65%	0.28
Hispanic			352	0.21%		4	0.59%	12,126	7.13%	0.08
Asian			137	0.08%		2	0.29%	1,375	0.81%	0.36
Native American			114	0.07%		3	0.44%	1,768	1.04%	0.42
African American			26	0.02%		4	0.59%	693	0.41%	1.44
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				298	0.18%	
Other/Unknown	61	8.97%	380	0.22%	40.13	507	74.56%	9,832	5.78%	12.89
Total	68	10.00%	29,343	17.26%	0.58	680	100.00%	170,009	100.00%	1.00

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	28.57%	2,173	10.79%	2.65	6	85.71%	11,274	55.97%	1.53
Hispanic			53	0.26%				3,372	16.74%	
Asian			6	0.03%				45	0.22%	
Native American			131	0.65%		1	14.29%	2,744	13.62%	1.05
African American			6	0.03%				47	0.23%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								39	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			47	0.23%				2,623	13.02%	
Total	2	28.57%	2,416	11.99%	2.38	7	100.00%	20,144	100.00%	1.00

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	7	6.73%	15,849	23.22%	0.29	30	28.85%	30,207	44.25%	0.65
Hispanic			1,330	1.95%				1,669	2.44%	
Asian			114	0.17%				209	0.31%	
Native American			242	0.35%		1	0.96%	504	0.74%	1.30
African American	1	0.96%	66	0.10%	9.95			105	0.15%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			27	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			1,174	1.72%		54	51.92%	1,265	1.85%	28.02
Total	8	7.69%	18,802	27.54%	0.28	85	81.73%	33,997	49.80%	1.64

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	4.55%	13,305	21.91%	0.21	18	40.91%	26,059	42.91%	0.95
Hispanic	1	2.27%	2,177	3.58%	0.63	1	2.27%	2,621	4.32%	0.53
Asian			131	0.22%				262	0.43%	
Native American			986	1.62%		2	4.55%	1,230	2.03%	2.24
African American			124	0.20%				191	0.31%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			25	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			1,899	3.13%		16	36.36%	1,999	3.29%	11.05
Total	3	6.82%	18,647	30.70%	0.22	37	84.09%	32,400	53.35%	1.58

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			1,579	23.21%		1	16.67%	2,915	42.84%	0.39
Hispanic			172	2.53%		1	16.67%	221	3.25%	5.13
Asian			19	0.28%				23	0.34%	
Native American			74	1.09%				86	1.26%	
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								6	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			171	2.51%		2	33.33%	204	3.00%	11.12
Total		0.00%	2,019	29.67%		4	66.67%	3,460	50.85%	1.31

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	1.92%	14,874	21.79%	0.09	39	37.50%	60,930	89.25%	0.42
Hispanic			230	0.34%				3,229	4.73%	
Asian			68	0.10%				391	0.57%	
Native American			78	0.11%		1	0.96%	824	1.21%	0.80
African American			17	0.02%		1	0.96%	188	0.28%	3.49
Hawaiian/Pac Is			5	0.01%				70	0.10%	
Other/Unknown	9	8.65%	195	0.29%	30.30	63	60.58%	2,634	3.86%	15.70
Total	11	10.58%	15,467	22.66%	0.47	104	100.00%	68,266	100.00%	1.00

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	2.27%	9,034	14.88%	0.15	21	47.73%	48,398	79.69%	0.60
Hispanic			163	0.27%		2	4.55%	4,961	8.17%	0.56
Asian			48	0.08%				441	0.73%	
Native American			165	0.27%		2	4.55%	2,381	3.92%	1.16
African American			54	0.09%				369	0.61%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			6	0.01%				69	0.11%	
Other/Unknown	3	6.82%	213	0.35%	19.44	19	43.18%	4,111	6.77%	6.38
Total	4	9.09%	9,683	15.94%	0.57	44	100.00%	60,730	100.00%	1.00

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	33.33%	1,288	18.93%	1.76	3	50.00%	5,782	84.98%	0.59
Hispanic			11	0.16%		1	16.67%	404	5.94%	2.81
Asian			4	0.06%				46	0.68%	
Native American			4	0.06%				164	2.41%	
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.15%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.04%				9	0.13%	
Other/Unknown			14	0.21%		2	33.33%	389	5.72%	5.83
Total	2	33.33%	1,325	19.47%	1.71	6	100.00%	6,804	100.00%	1.00

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	21	3.35%	63,976	21.47%	0.16	423	67.57%	149,310	50.11%	1.35
Hispanic	1	0.16%	5,638	1.89%	0.08	13	2.08%	8,867	2.98%	0.70
Asian			1,154	0.39%		5	0.80%	4,418	1.48%	0.54
Native American			1,137	0.38%		6	0.96%	1,994	0.67%	1.43
African American			753	0.25%		9	1.44%	1,486	0.50%	2.88
Hawaiian/Pac Is			166	0.06%				369	0.12%	
Other/Unknown	10	1.60%	6,628	2.22%	0.72	99	15.81%	8,729	2.93%	5.40
Total	32	5.11%	79,452	26.67%	0.19	555	88.66%	175,173	58.79%	1.51

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	4.48%	8,008	20.11%	0.22	39	58.21%	17,463	43.85%	1.33
Hispanic			777	1.95%				1,276	3.20%	
Asian			112	0.28%				182	0.46%	
Native American			504	1.27%				678	1.70%	
African American			45	0.11%				76	0.19%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.05%				43	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			848	2.13%		21	31.34%	1,041	2.61%	11.99
Total	3	4.48%	10,312	25.89%	0.17	60	89.55%	20,759	52.13%	1.72

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	1.80%	24,250	25.51%	0.07	50	45.05%	45,283	47.63%	0.95
Hispanic	1	0.90%	1,874	1.97%	0.46			2,501	2.63%	
Asian			230	0.24%		2	1.80%	397	0.42%	4.31
Native American			401	0.42%				701	0.74%	
African American			131	0.14%				164	0.17%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			47	0.05%				83	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			1,771	1.86%		44	39.64%	2,139	2.25%	17.62
Total	3	2.70%	28,704	30.19%	0.09	96	86.49%	51,268	53.93%	1.60

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	13	2.08%	41,846	14.04%	0.15	457	73.00%	255,132	85.63%	0.85
Hispanic			369	0.12%		14	2.24%	14,874	4.99%	0.45
Asian			272	0.09%		5	0.80%	5,844	1.96%	0.41
Native American			150	0.05%		6	0.96%	3,281	1.10%	0.87
African American			128	0.04%		9	1.44%	2,367	0.79%	1.81
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				553	0.19%	
Other/Unknown	26	4.15%	540	0.18%	22.92	135	21.57%	15,897	5.34%	4.04
Total	39	6.23%	43,323	14.54%	0.43	626	100.00%	297,948	100.00%	1.00

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	1.49%	8,463	21.25%	0.07	43	64.18%	33,934	85.21%	0.75
Hispanic			66	0.17%				2,119	5.32%	
Asian			40	0.10%				334	0.84%	
Native American			66	0.17%				1,248	3.13%	
African American			1	0.00%				122	0.31%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				65	0.16%	
Other/Unknown	3	4.48%	112	0.28%	15.92	24	35.82%	2,001	5.02%	7.13
Total	4	5.97%	8,752	21.98%	0.27	67	100.00%	39,823	100.00%	1.00

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	5	4.50%	14,594	15.35%	0.29	57	51.35%	84,127	88.49%	0.58
Hispanic			139	0.15%		1	0.90%	4,514	4.75%	0.19
Asian			55	0.06%		2	1.80%	682	0.72%	2.51
Native American			67	0.07%				1,169	1.23%	
African American			13	0.01%				308	0.32%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				133	0.14%	
Other/Unknown	7	6.31%	222	0.23%	27.00	51	45.95%	4,132	4.35%	10.57
Total	12	10.81%	15,093	15.88%	0.68	111	100.00%	95,065	100.00%	1.00

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			5,778	15.78%		10	83.33%	11,633	31.77%	2.62
Hispanic			3,501	9.56%				4,329	11.82%	
Asian			79	0.22%				215	0.59%	
Native American			97	0.26%				186	0.51%	
African American			43	0.12%		1	8.33%	332	0.91%	9.19
Hawaiian/Pac Is			9	0.02%				10	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			2,728	7.45%				3,088	8.43%	
Total		0.00%	12,235	33.41%		11	91.67%	19,793	54.05%	1.70

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	8	1.64%	57,732	19.07%	0.09	329	67.42%	112,969	37.31%	1.81
Hispanic	3	0.61%	19,980	6.60%	0.09	34	6.97%	27,860	9.20%	0.76
Asian	1	0.20%	1,352	0.45%	0.46			2,725	0.90%	
Native American	1	0.20%	1,397	0.46%	0.44	1	0.20%	2,174	0.72%	0.29
African American			794	0.26%		5	1.02%	1,545	0.51%	2.01
Hawaiian/Pac Is			356	0.12%				591	0.20%	
Other/Unknown	2	0.41%	16,332	5.39%	0.08	51	10.45%	20,927	6.91%	1.51
Total	15	3.07%	97,943	32.34%	0.10	420	86.07%	168,791	55.74%	1.54

Morrow and Wheeler Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			2,525	18.20%		10	90.91%	4,524	32.61%	2.79
Hispanic			1,263	9.11%				1,460	10.53%	
Asian			15	0.11%				22	0.16%	
Native American			65	0.47%				85	0.61%	
African American			7	0.05%				8	0.06%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.03%				5	0.04%	
Other/Unknown			1,120	8.07%				1,197	8.63%	
Total		0.00%	4,999	36.04%		10	90.91%	7,301	52.63%	1.73

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	8.33%	3,872	10.57%	0.79	11	91.67%	21,283	58.12%	1.58
Hispanic			269	0.73%				8,099	22.12%	
Asian			249	0.68%				543	1.48%	
Native American			13	0.04%				296	0.81%	
African American			9	0.02%		1	8.33%	384	1.05%	7.95
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				22	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			175	0.48%				5,991	16.36%	
Total	1	8.33%	4,590	12.53%	0.66	12	100.00%	36,618	100.00%	1.00

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	51	10.45%	33,787	11.16%	0.94	388	79.51%	204,488	67.53%	1.18
Hispanic			874	0.29%		37	7.58%	48,714	16.09%	0.47
Asian			332	0.11%		1	0.20%	4,409	1.46%	0.14
Native American	2	0.41%	166	0.05%	7.48	4	0.82%	3,737	1.23%	0.66
African American			76	0.03%		5	1.02%	2,415	0.80%	1.28
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.01%				967	0.32%	
Other/Unknown			825	0.27%		53	10.86%	38,084	12.58%	0.86
Total	53	10.86%	36,080	11.91%	0.91	488	100.00%	302,814	100.00%	1.00

Morrow and Wheeler Counties -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	9.09%	1,475	10.63%	0.85	11	100.00%	8,524	61.45%	1.63
Hispanic			42	0.30%				2,765	19.93%	
Asian			6	0.04%				43	0.31%	
Native American			4	0.03%				154	1.11%	
African American			1	0.01%				16	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.01%				10	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			42	0.30%				2,359	17.01%	
Total	1	9.09%	1,571	11.33%	0.80	11	100.00%	13,871	100.00%	1.00

Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	37	1.75%	102,734	16.17%	0.11	1,393	65.96%	290,264	45.68%	1.44
Hispanic	3	0.14%	17,548	2.76%	0.05	44	2.08%	31,100	4.89%	0.43
Asian			9,329	1.47%		45	2.13%	21,356	3.36%	0.63
Native American	1	0.05%	1,761	0.28%	0.17	22	1.04%	4,008	0.63%	1.65
African American	17	0.80%	11,804	1.86%	0.43	205	9.71%	19,144	3.01%	3.22
Hawaiian/Pac Is			738	0.12%				1,406	0.22%	
Other/Unknown	17	0.80%	20,884	3.29%	0.24	258	12.22%	28,841	4.54%	2.69
Total	75	3.55%	164,798	25.93%	0.14	1,967	93.13%	396,119	62.33%	1.49

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	1.35%	13,170	21.80%	0.06	42	56.76%	26,543	43.93%	1.29
Hispanic			2,261	3.74%		6	8.11%	3,090	5.11%	1.59
Asian			169	0.28%				382	0.63%	
Native American			408	0.68%		1	1.35%	564	0.93%	1.45
African American			99	0.16%				142	0.24%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			44	0.07%				98	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			1,925	3.19%		16	21.62%	2,150	3.56%	6.08
Total	1	1.35%	18,076	29.92%	0.05	65	87.84%	32,969	54.57%	1.61

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	2.22%	4,853	22.04%	0.10	30	66.67%	9,879	44.86%	1.49
Hispanic			542	2.46%				681	3.09%	
Asian			32	0.15%				72	0.33%	
Native American			113	0.51%		1	2.22%	131	0.59%	3.74
African American			19	0.09%				27	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.08%				29	0.13%	
Other/Unknown	1	2.22%	361	1.64%	1.36	11	24.44%	449	2.04%	11.99
Total	2	4.44%	5,938	26.96%	0.16	42	93.33%	11,268	51.16%	1.82

Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	59	2.79%	66,019	10.39%	0.27	1,489	70.50%	459,017	72.23%	0.98
Hispanic			959	0.15%		47	2.23%	49,607	7.81%	0.29
Asian			3,052	0.48%		45	2.13%	33,737	5.31%	0.40
Native American	1	0.05%	298	0.05%	1.01	24	1.14%	6,067	0.95%	1.19
African American	4	0.19%	2,936	0.46%	0.41	226	10.70%	33,884	5.33%	2.01
Hawaiian/Pac Is			48	0.01%				2,192	0.34%	
Other/Unknown	6	0.28%	1,254	0.20%	1.44	281	13.30%	50,979	8.02%	1.66
Total	70	3.31%	74,566	11.73%	0.28	2,112	100.00%	635,483	100.00%	1.00

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	9.46%	8,989	14.88%	0.64	50	67.57%	48,702	80.61%	0.84
Hispanic			129	0.21%		6	8.11%	5,480	9.07%	0.89
Asian			46	0.08%				597	0.99%	
Native American			66	0.11%		1	1.35%	1,038	1.72%	0.79
African American			5	0.01%				246	0.41%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				146	0.24%	
Other/Unknown	1	1.35%	133	0.22%	6.14	17	22.97%	4,208	6.96%	3.30
Total	8	10.81%	9,372	15.51%	0.70	74	100.00%	60,417	100.00%	1.00

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			4,695	21.32%		31	68.89%	19,427	88.21%	0.78
Hispanic			21	0.10%				1,244	5.65%	
Asian			25	0.11%				129	0.59%	
Native American			13	0.06%		1	2.22%	257	1.17%	1.90
African American			5	0.02%				51	0.23%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				49	0.22%	
Other/Unknown	1	2.22%	57	0.26%	8.59	13	28.89%	867	3.94%	7.34
Total	1	2.22%	4,818	21.88%	0.10	45	100.00%	22,024	100.00%	1.00

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	1.49%	14,567	19.59%	0.08	47	70.15%	28,205	37.93%	1.85
Hispanic			4,949	6.66%		5	7.46%	6,185	8.32%	0.90
Asian			140	0.19%		2	2.99%	284	0.38%	7.82
Native American			821	1.10%		5	7.46%	1,182	1.59%	4.69
African American			136	0.18%		3	4.48%	409	0.55%	8.14
Hawaiian/Pac Is			46	0.06%				69	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			3,882	5.22%		2	2.99%	4,570	6.15%	0.49
Total	1	1.49%	24,541	33.00%	0.05	64	95.52%	40,904	55.01%	1.74

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			5,591	25.33%		15	83.33%	11,046	50.05%	1.67
Hispanic			239	1.08%		1	5.56%	346	1.57%	3.54
Asian			49	0.22%				136	0.62%	
Native American			61	0.28%		1	5.56%	119	0.54%	10.30
African American			36	0.16%				74	0.34%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			45	0.20%				101	0.46%	
Other/Unknown	1	5.56%	264	1.20%	4.64			335	1.52%	
Total	1	5.56%	6,285	28.47%	0.20	17	94.44%	12,157	55.08%	1.71

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,656	26.29%		3	60.00%	2,946	46.76%	1.28
Hispanic			65	1.03%				56	0.89%	
Asian			2	0.03%				6	0.10%	
Native American			17	0.27%		1	20.00%	27	0.43%	46.67
African American								2	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.02%				2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			79	1.25%				73	1.16%	
Total		0.00%	1,820	28.89%		4	80.00%	3,112	49.40%	1.62

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	2.99%	8,260	11.11%	0.27	50	74.63%	51,032	68.63%	1.09
Hispanic			232	0.31%		5	7.46%	11,366	15.29%	0.49
Asian			38	0.05%		2	2.99%	462	0.62%	4.80
Native American			137	0.18%		5	7.46%	2,140	2.88%	2.59
African American			24	0.03%		3	4.48%	569	0.77%	5.85
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.00%				117	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			220	0.30%		2	2.99%	8,672	11.66%	0.26
Total	2	2.99%	8,913	11.99%	0.25	67	100.00%	74,358	100.00%	1.00

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,535	16.02%		15	83.33%	20,172	91.39%	0.91
Hispanic			15	0.07%		1	5.56%	600	2.72%	2.04
Asian			8	0.04%				193	0.87%	
Native American			10	0.05%		1	5.56%	190	0.86%	6.45
African American			8	0.04%				118	0.53%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				148	0.67%	
Other/Unknown			52	0.24%		1	5.56%	651	2.95%	1.88
Total		0.00%	3,630	16.45%		18	100.00%	22,072	100.00%	1.00

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	20.00%	1,352	21.46%	0.93	4	80.00%	5,954	94.51%	0.85
Hispanic			4	0.06%				125	1.98%	
Asian			2	0.03%				10	0.16%	
Native American			2	0.03%		1	20.00%	46	0.73%	27.39
African American								2	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			8	0.13%				160	2.54%	
Total	1	20.00%	1,368	21.71%	0.92	5	100.00%	6,300	100.00%	1.00

Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	14	3.29%	92,730	20.72%	0.16	229	53.88%	193,607	43.26%	1.25
Hispanic	2	0.47%	18,435	4.12%	0.11	19	4.47%	30,587	6.83%	0.65
Asian			7,665	1.71%		8	1.88%	17,934	4.01%	0.47
Native American			823	0.18%		2	0.47%	1,719	0.38%	1.23
African American	1	0.24%	1,665	0.37%	0.63	9	2.12%	3,033	0.68%	3.12
Hawaiian/Pac Is			417	0.09%				801	0.18%	
Other/Unknown	1	0.24%	16,318	3.65%	0.06	126	29.65%	21,718	4.85%	6.11
Total	18	4.24%	138,053	30.85%	0.14	393	92.47%	269,399	60.20%	1.54

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	3.03%	19,516	22.94%	0.13	39	59.09%	37,980	44.63%	1.32
Hispanic			3,482	4.09%		2	3.03%	5,357	6.30%	0.48
Asian			183	0.22%				569	0.67%	
Native American	1	1.52%	419	0.49%	3.08			676	0.79%	
African American			132	0.16%		1	1.52%	564	0.66%	2.29
Hawaiian/Pac Is			26	0.03%				65	0.08%	
Other/Unknown			2,567	3.02%		20	30.30%	3,400	4.00%	7.58
Total	3	4.55%	26,325	30.94%	0.15	62	93.94%	48,611	57.13%	1.64

Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			9,657	19.37%		17	68.00%	18,544	37.20%	1.83
Hispanic			3,153	6.32%		1	4.00%	4,163	8.35%	0.48
Asian			98	0.20%		1	4.00%	228	0.46%	8.75
Native American			459	0.92%		2	8.00%	544	1.09%	7.33
African American			64	0.13%				105	0.21%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			54	0.11%				76	0.15%	
Other/Unknown			2,368	4.75%				2,903	5.82%	
Total		0.00%	15,853	31.80%		21	84.00%	26,563	53.28%	1.58

Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	9	2.12%	37,018	8.27%	0.26	252	59.29%	323,355	72.26%	0.82
Hispanic			713	0.16%		21	4.94%	49,735	11.11%	0.44
Asian			1,453	0.32%		8	1.88%	27,052	6.04%	0.31
Native American			83	0.02%		2	0.47%	2,625	0.59%	0.80
African American			128	0.03%		10	2.35%	4,826	1.08%	2.18
Hawaiian/Pac Is			28	0.01%				1,246	0.28%	
Other/Unknown	5	1.18%	641	0.14%	8.21	132	31.06%	38,677	8.64%	3.59
Total	14	3.29%	40,064	8.95%	0.37	425	100.00%	447,516	100.00%	1.00

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			9,717	11.42%		41	62.12%	67,213	78.99%	0.79
Hispanic			178	0.21%		2	3.03%	9,017	10.60%	0.29
Asian			45	0.05%				797	0.94%	
Native American			47	0.06%		1	1.52%	1,142	1.34%	1.13
African American			17	0.02%		1	1.52%	713	0.84%	1.81
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				98	0.12%	
Other/Unknown	1	1.52%	144	0.17%	8.95	21	31.82%	6,111	7.18%	4.43
Total	1	1.52%	10,155	11.93%	0.13	66	100.00%	85,091	100.00%	1.00

Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - Acute Services

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	8.00%	6,976	13.99%	0.57	19	76.00%	35,177	70.56%	1.08
Hispanic			134	0.27%		1	4.00%	7,450	14.94%	0.27
Asian			111	0.22%		1	4.00%	437	0.88%	4.56
Native American			68	0.14%		2	8.00%	1,071	2.15%	3.72
African American			13	0.03%				182	0.37%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				133	0.27%	
Other/Unknown	2	8.00%	135	0.27%	29.54	2	8.00%	5,406	10.84%	0.74
Total	4	16.00%	7,440	14.92%	1.07	25	100.00%	49,856	100.00%	1.00

Ethnicity	Unknown					OPRCS - Acute Services				
	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	5	2.62%				140	73.30%			
Hispanic						2	1.05%			
Asian						1	0.52%			
Native American						3	1.57%			
African American						12	6.28%			
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown						25	13.09%			
Total	5	2.62%		0.00%		183	95.81%		0.00%	

Ethnicity	Unknown					OPRCS - Acute Services				
	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3	1.57%				148	77.49%			
Hispanic						2	1.05%			
Asian						1	0.52%			
Native American						3	1.57%			
African American						12	6.28%			
Hawaiian/Pac Is										
Other/Unknown						25	13.09%			
Total	3	1.57%		0.00%		191	100.00%		0.00%	

Statewide Comparable Access Ratios - State Hospital
Statewide -- Oregon Patient / Resident Care System -- State Hospital Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	61	7.52%	686,301	20.88%	0.36	547	67.45%	1,480,374	45.04%	1.50
Hispanic	4	0.49%	107,775	3.28%	0.15	35	4.32%	161,577	4.92%	0.88
Asian	2	0.25%	24,712	0.75%	0.33	17	2.10%	58,993	1.79%	1.17
Native American	3	0.37%	14,480	0.44%	0.84	13	1.60%	23,870	0.73%	2.21
African American	9	1.11%	17,437	0.53%	2.09	51	6.29%	30,070	0.91%	6.87
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2,484	0.08%				4,729	0.14%	
Other/Unknown			101,112	3.08%				128,882	3.92%	
Total	79	9.74%	954,301	29.03%	0.34	663	81.75%	1,888,495	57.45%	1.42

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,807	25.61%		2	100.00%	6,893	46.37%	2.16
Hispanic			158	1.06%				214	1.44%	
Asian			10	0.07%				31	0.21%	
Native American			63	0.42%				84	0.57%	
African American			9	0.06%				25	0.17%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				2	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			162	1.09%				200	1.35%	
Total		0.00%	4,212	28.33%		2	100.00%	7,449	50.11%	2.00

Benton County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	14.29%	14,530	19.82%	0.72	3	42.86%	39,395	53.73%	0.80
Hispanic			1,190	1.62%				2,394	3.26%	
Asian			565	0.77%		1	14.29%	2,577	3.51%	4.06
Native American			163	0.22%				382	0.52%	
African American	1	14.29%	165	0.23%	63.48			457	0.62%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			34	0.05%				142	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			1,201	1.64%				2,043	2.79%	
Total	2	28.57%	17,848	24.34%	1.17	4	57.14%	47,390	64.63%	0.88

Statewide -- Oregon Patient / Resident Care System -- State Hospital Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	64	7.89%	418,294	12.73%	0.62	672	82.86%	2,584,969	78.64%	1.05
Hispanic			5,962	0.18%		39	4.81%	275,314	8.38%	0.57
Asian			6,981	0.21%		19	2.34%	90,686	2.76%	0.85
Native American			2,254	0.07%		16	1.97%	40,604	1.24%	1.60
African American	5	0.62%	3,616	0.11%	5.60	65	8.01%	51,123	1.56%	5.15
Hawaiian/Pac Is			229	0.01%				7,442	0.23%	
Other/Unknown			6,797	0.21%				236,791	7.20%	
Total	69	8.51%	444,133	13.51%	0.63	811	100.00%	3,286,929	100.00%	

Baker County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,135	21.09%		2	100.00%	13,835	93.06%	1.07
Hispanic			20	0.13%				392	2.64%	
Asian			10	0.07%				51	0.34%	
Native American			12	0.08%				159	1.07%	
African American			2	0.01%				36	0.24%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								5	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.17%				388	2.61%	
Total		0.00%	3,205	21.56%		2	100.00%	14,866	100.00%	1.00

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	14.29%	7,750	10.57%	1.35	5	71.43%	61,675	84.11%	0.85
Hispanic			61	0.08%				3,645	4.97%	
Asian			145	0.20%		1	14.29%	3,287	4.48%	3.19
Native American			25	0.03%				570	0.78%	
African American			12	0.02%		1	14.29%	634	0.86%	16.52
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				180	0.25%	
Other/Unknown			90	0.12%				3,334	4.55%	
Total	1	14.29%	8,087	11.03%	1.30	7	100.00%	73,325	100.00%	1.00

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	7	12.96%	77,943	25.09%	0.52	40	74.07%	152,535	49.10%	1.51
Hispanic			6,340	2.04%		1	1.85%	10,049	3.23%	0.57
Asian			2,157	0.69%				4,536	1.46%	
Native American			719	0.23%				1,324	0.43%	
African American	1	1.85%	758	0.24%	7.59			1,205	0.39%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			180	0.06%				316	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			6,763	2.18%				8,053	2.59%	
Total	8	14.81%	94,860	30.53%	0.49	41	75.93%	178,018	57.30%	1.32

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			7,613	23.48%		3	42.86%	15,592	48.08%	0.89
Hispanic			599	1.85%		1	14.29%	966	2.98%	4.80
Asian			96	0.30%				209	0.64%	
Native American			116	0.36%				189	0.58%	
African American			52	0.16%		1	14.29%	124	0.38%	37.36
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.06%				31	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			537	1.66%				706	2.18%	
Total		0.00%	9,033	27.86%		5	71.43%	17,817	54.94%	1.30

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	16.67%	10,965	28.01%	0.59	4	66.67%	19,954	50.98%	1.31
Hispanic			500	1.28%				563	1.44%	
Asian			68	0.17%				117	0.30%	
Native American			176	0.45%				299	0.76%	
African American			41	0.10%				47	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			10	0.03%				26	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			642	1.64%				642	1.64%	
Total	1	16.67%	12,402	31.68%	0.53	4	66.67%	21,648	55.30%	1.21

Clackamas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	5	9.26%	36,295	11.68%	0.79	52	96.30%	266,773	85.87%	1.12
Hispanic			355	0.11%		1	1.85%	16,744	5.39%	0.34
Asian			540	0.17%				7,233	2.33%	
Native American			114	0.04%				2,157	0.69%	
African American			81	0.03%		1	1.85%	2,044	0.66%	2.81
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.00%				509	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			385	0.12%				15,201	4.89%	
Total	5	9.26%	37,783	12.16%	0.76	54	100.00%	310,661	100.00%	1.00

Clatsop County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	28.57%	5,396	16.64%	1.72	5	71.43%	28,601	88.20%	0.81
Hispanic			32	0.10%		1	14.29%	1,597	4.92%	2.90
Asian			56	0.17%				361	1.11%	
Native American			22	0.07%				327	1.01%	
African American			5	0.02%		1	14.29%	181	0.56%	25.59
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				54	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			63	0.19%				1,306	4.03%	
Total	2	28.57%	557	17.20%	1.66	7	100.00%	32,427	100.00%	1.00

Columbia County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	16.67%	4,932	12.60%	1.32	6	100.00%	35,851	91.59%	1.09
Hispanic			30	0.08%				1,093	2.79%	
Asian			22	0.06%				207	0.53%	
Native American			37	0.09%				512	1.31%	
African American			9	0.02%				97	0.25%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				38	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			61	0.16%				1,345	3.44%	
Total	1	16.67%	5,093	13.01%	1.28	6	100.00%	39,143	100.00%	1.00

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	14.29%	12,022	21.50%	0.66	15	71.43%	25,648	45.88%	1.56
Hispanic			863	1.54%				1,135	2.03%	
Asian			131	0.23%				276	0.49%	
Native American			504	0.90%		1	4.76%	729	1.30%	3.65
African American			70	0.13%		1	4.76%	99	0.18%	26.89
Hawaiian/Pac Is			29	0.05%				51	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			1,013	1.81%				1,180	2.11%	
Total	3	14.29%	14,632	26.17%	0.55	17	80.95%	29,118	52.08%	1.55

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			4,575	25.67%		1	100.00%	8,144	45.69%	2.19
Hispanic			481	2.70%				579	3.25%	
Asian			28	0.16%				41	0.23%	
Native American			70	0.39%				133	0.75%	
African American			1	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				1	0.01%	
Other/Unknown			423	2.37%				499	2.80%	
Total		0.00%	5,581	31.31%		1	100.00%	9,403	52.75%	1.90

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,559	19.07%		2	66.67%	7,548	40.43%	1.65
Hispanic			319	1.71%				405	2.17%	
Asian			35	0.19%				65	0.35%	
Native American			155	0.83%				215	1.15%	
African American			5	0.03%				17	0.09%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.04%				10	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			304	1.63%				358	1.92%	
Total		0.00%	4,384	23.49%		2	66.67%	8,618	46.17%	1.44

Coos County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	4.76%	11,610	20.77%	0.23	19	90.48%	49,280	88.15%	1.03
Hispanic			135	0.24%				2,133	3.82%	
Asian			72	0.13%				479	0.86%	
Native American			108	0.19%		1	4.76%	1,341	2.40%	1.99
African American			17	0.03%		1	4.76%	186	0.33%	14.31
Hawaiian/Pac Is			13	0.02%				93	0.17%	
Other/Unknown			200	0.36%				2,393	4.28%	
Total	1	4.76%	12,155	21.74%	0.22	21	100.00%	55,905	100.00%	1.00

Crook County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			2,772	15.55%		1	100.00%	15,491	86.91%	1.15
Hispanic			22	0.12%				1,082	6.07%	
Asian			3	0.02%				72	0.40%	
Native American			15	0.08%				218	1.22%	
African American								7	0.04%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				6	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			26	0.15%				948	5.32%	
Total		0.00%	2,840	15.93%		1	100.00%	17,824	100.00%	1.00

Curry County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	1	33.33%	5,471	29.31%	1.14	3	100.00%	16,578	88.81%	1.13
Hispanic			37	0.20%				761	4.08%	
Asian			17	0.09%				117	0.63%	
Native American			35	0.19%				405	2.17%	
African American			7	0.04%				29	0.16%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.02%				20	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			95	0.51%				757	4.06%	
Total	1	33.33%	5,665	30.35%	1.10	3	100.00%	18,667	100.00%	1.00

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	8.33%	26,394	25.21%	0.33	11	91.67%	53,729	51.32%	1.79
Hispanic			1,709	1.63%				2,456	2.35%	
Asian			205	0.20%				488	0.47%	
Native American			292	0.28%				487	0.47%	
African American			94	0.09%				116	0.11%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.02%				50	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			1,580	1.51%				1,840	1.76%	
Total	1	8.33%	30,292	28.94%	0.29	11	91.67%	59,166	56.52%	1.62

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	7.14%	21,936	24.31%	0.29	18	64.29%	42,098	46.66%	1.38
Hispanic	1	3.57%	1,349	1.50%	2.39	2	7.14%	1,768	1.96%	3.65
Asian	1	3.57%	157	0.17%	20.53			302	0.33%	
Native American	1	3.57%	490	0.54%	6.58			739	0.82%	
African American			55	0.06%				104	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			23	0.03%				62	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			1,418	1.57%				1,675	1.86%	
Total	5	17.86%	25,428	28.18%	0.63	20	71.43%	46,748	51.81%	1.38

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,922	27.34%				3,335	47.44%	
Hispanic			64	0.91%				93	1.32%	
Asian			3	0.04%				10	0.14%	
Native American			52	0.74%				52	0.74%	
African American			3	0.04%				3	0.04%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			65	0.92%				90	1.28%	
Total		0.00%	2,109	30.00%			0.00%	3,585	51.00%	

Deschutes County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			14,825	14.16%		12	100.00%	94,948	90.70%	1.10
Hispanic			139	0.13%				4,304	4.11%	
Asian			49	0.05%				742	0.71%	
Native American			59	0.06%				838	0.80%	
African American			4	0.00%				214	0.20%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				75	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			145	0.14%				3,565	3.41%	
Total		0.00%	15,228	14.55%		12	100.00%	104,686	100.00%	1.00

Douglas County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3	10.71%	17,411	19.30%	0.56	23	82.14%	81,445	90.26%	0.91
Hispanic			166	0.18%		3	10.71%	3,283	3.64%	2.94
Asian			63	0.07%		1	3.57%	522	0.58%	6.17
Native American			119	0.13%		1	3.57%	1,348	1.49%	2.39
African American			10	0.01%				169	0.19%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				88	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			282	0.31%				3,375	3.74%	
Total	3	10.71%	18,054	20.01%	0.54	28	100.00%	90,230	100.00%	1.00

Grant County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			1,308	18.61%				6,565	93.39%	
Hispanic			6	0.09%				163	2.32%	
Asian								13	0.18%	
Native American			7	0.10%				111	1.58%	
African American								6	0.09%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			15	0.21%				170	2.42%	
Total		0.00%	1,336	19.00%			0.00%	7,030	100.00%	

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,754	25.22%		1	100.00%	3,229	46.42%	2.15
Hispanic			143	2.06%				167	2.40%	
Asian			5	0.07%				23	0.33%	
Native American			100	1.44%				157	2.26%	
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.04%	
Other/Unknown			112	1.61%				113	1.62%	
Total		0.00%	2,118	30.45%		1	100.00%	3,697	53.15%	1.88

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	5.26%	38,601	22.71%	0.23	30	78.95%	77,000	45.29%	1.74
Hispanic			5,158	3.03%		2	5.26%	6,616	3.89%	1.35
Asian			366	0.22%				872	0.51%	
Native American			561	0.33%				1,093	0.64%	
African American	1	2.63%	240	0.14%	18.64	1	2.63%	427	0.25%	10.48
Hawaiian/Pac Is			97	0.06%				183	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			4,395	2.59%				5,057	2.97%	
Total	3	7.89%	49,418	29.07%	0.27	33	86.84%	91,248	53.67%	1.62

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,204	15.91%		3	100.00%	5,897	29.27%	3.42
Hispanic			1,516	7.53%				1,803	8.95%	
Asian			13	0.06%				26	0.13%	
Native American			1,234	6.13%				1,379	6.85%	
African American			18	0.09%				23	0.11%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			19	0.09%				20	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			1,178	5.85%				1,398	6.94%	
Total		0.00%	7,182	35.65%		3	100.00%	10,546	52.35%	1.91

Harney County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,106	15.90%		1	100.00%	6,089	87.54%	1.14
Hispanic			6	0.09%				316	4.54%	
Asian			7	0.10%				35	0.50%	
Native American			19	0.27%				276	3.97%	
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.14%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.03%				5	0.07%	
Other/Unknown								225	3.23%	
Total		0.00%	1,141	16.40%		1	100.00%	6,956	100.00%	1.00

Jackson County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	5.26%	28,316	16.66%	0.32	34	89.47%	143,917	84.65%	1.06
Hispanic			352	0.21%		2	5.26%	12,126	7.13%	0.74
Asian			137	0.08%				1,375	0.81%	
Native American			114	0.07%				1,768	1.04%	
African American			26	0.02%		2	5.26%	693	0.41%	12.91
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				298	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			380	0.22%				9,832	5.78%	
Total	2	5.26%	29,343	17.26%	0.30	38	100.00%	170,009	100.00%	1.00

Jefferson County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			2,173	10.79%		3	100.00%	11,274	55.97%	1.79
Hispanic			53	0.26%				3,372	16.74%	
Asian			6	0.03%				45	0.22%	
Native American			131	0.65%				2,744	13.62%	
African American			6	0.03%				47	0.23%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								39	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			47	0.23%				2,623	13.02%	
Total		0.00%	2,416	11.99%		3	100.00%	20,144	100.00%	1.00

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			15,849	23.22%		16	100.00%	30,207	44.25%	2.26
Hispanic			1,330	1.95%				1,669	2.44%	
Asian			114	0.17%				209	0.31%	
Native American			242	0.35%				504	0.74%	
African American			66	0.10%				105	0.15%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			27	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			1,174	1.72%				1,265	1.85%	
Total		0.00%	18,802	27.54%		16	100.00%	33,997	49.80%	2.01

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	6	27.27%	13,305	21.91%	1.24	13	59.09%	26,059	42.91%	1.38
Hispanic			2,177	3.58%				2,621	4.32%	
Asian			131	0.22%				262	0.43%	
Native American			986	1.62%		2	9.09%	1,230	2.03%	4.49
African American			124	0.20%		1	4.55%	191	0.31%	14.45
Hawaiian/Pac Is			25	0.04%				38	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			1,899	3.13%				1,999	3.29%	
Total	6	27.27%	18,647	30.70%	0.89	16	72.73%	32,400	53.35%	1.36

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,579	23.21%				2,915	42.84%	
Hispanic			172	2.53%				221	3.25%	
Asian			19	0.28%				23	0.34%	
Native American			74	1.09%				86	1.26%	
African American			4	0.06%				5	0.07%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								6	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			171	2.51%				204	3.00%	
Total		0.00%	2,019	29.67%			0.00%	3,460	50.85%	

Josephine County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			14,874	21.79%		16	100.00%	60,930	89.25%	1.12
Hispanic			230	0.34%				3,229	4.73%	
Asian			68	0.10%				391	0.57%	
Native American			78	0.11%				824	1.21%	
African American			17	0.02%				188	0.28%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			5	0.01%				70	0.10%	
Other/Unknown			195	0.29%				2,634	3.86%	
Total		0.00%	15,467	22.66%		16	100.00%	68,266	100.00%	1.00

Klamath County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			9,034	14.88%		19	86.36%	48,398	79.69%	1.08
Hispanic			163	0.27%				4,961	8.17%	
Asian			48	0.08%				441	0.73%	
Native American			165	0.27%		2	9.09%	2,381	3.92%	2.32
African American			54	0.09%		1	4.55%	369	0.61%	7.48
Hawaiian/Pac Is			6	0.01%				69	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			213	0.35%				4,111	6.77%	
Total		0.00%	9,683	15.94%		22	100.00%	60,730	100.00%	1.00

Lake County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,288	18.93%				5,782	84.98%	
Hispanic			11	0.16%				404	5.94%	
Asian			4	0.06%				46	0.68%	
Native American			4	0.06%				164	2.41%	
African American			1	0.01%				10	0.15%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.04%				9	0.13%	
Other/Unknown			14	0.21%				389	5.72%	
Total		0.00%	1,325	19.47%			0.00%	6,804	100.00%	

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	6	7.79%	63,976	21.47%	0.36	57	74.03%	149,310	50.11%	1.48
Hispanic			5,638	1.89%		2	2.60%	8,867	2.98%	0.87
Asian			1,154	0.39%		1	1.30%	4,418	1.48%	0.88
Native American			1,137	0.38%		2	2.60%	1,994	0.67%	3.88
African American			753	0.25%		2	2.60%	1,486	0.50%	5.21
Hawaiian/Pac Is			166	0.06%				369	0.12%	
Other/Unknown			6,628	2.22%				8,729	2.93%	
Total	6	7.79%	79,452	26.67%	0.29	64	83.12%	175,173	58.79%	1.41

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	4	22.22%	8,008	20.11%	1.11	13	72.22%	17,463	43.85%	1.65
Hispanic			777	1.95%				1,276	3.20%	
Asian			112	0.28%		1	5.56%	182	0.46%	12.16
Native American			504	1.27%				678	1.70%	
African American			45	0.11%				76	0.19%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.05%				43	0.11%	
Other/Unknown			848	2.13%				1,041	2.61%	
Total	4	22.22%	10,312	25.89%	0.86	14	77.78%	20,759	52.13%	1.49

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	2	12.50%	24,250	25.51%	0.49	10	62.50%	45,283	47.63%	1.31
Hispanic			1,874	1.97%		1	6.25%	2,501	2.63%	2.38
Asian			230	0.24%				397	0.42%	
Native American			401	0.42%				701	0.74%	
African American			131	0.14%				164	0.17%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			47	0.05%				83	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			1,771	1.86%				2,139	2.25%	
Total	2	12.50%	28,704	30.19%	0.41	11	68.75%	51,268	53.93%	1.27

Lane County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	7	9.09%	41,846	14.04%	0.65	70	90.91%	255,132	85.63%	1.06
Hispanic			369	0.12%		2	2.60%	14,874	4.99%	0.52
Asian			272	0.09%		1	1.30%	5,844	1.96%	0.66
Native American			150	0.05%		2	2.60%	3,281	1.10%	2.36
African American			128	0.04%		2	2.60%	2,367	0.79%	3.27
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.01%				553	0.19%	
Other/Unknown			540	0.18%				15,897	5.34%	
Total	7	9.09%	43,323	14.54%	0.63	77	100.00%	297,948	100.00%	1.00

Lincoln County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			8,463	21.25%		17	94.44%	33,934	85.21%	1.11
Hispanic			66	0.17%				2,119	5.32%	
Asian			40	0.10%		1	5.56%	334	0.84%	6.62
Native American			66	0.17%				1,248	3.13%	
African American			1	0.00%				122	0.31%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				65	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			112	0.28%				2,001	5.02%	
Total		0.00%	8,752	21.98%		18	100.00%	39,823	100.00%	1.00

Linn County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3	18.75%	14,594	15.35%	1.22	15	93.75%	84,127	88.49%	1.06
Hispanic			139	0.15%		1	6.25%	4,514	4.75%	1.32
Asian			55	0.06%				682	0.72%	
Native American			67	0.07%				1,169	1.23%	
African American			13	0.01%				308	0.32%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.00%				133	0.14%	
Other/Unknown			222	0.23%				4,132	4.35%	
Total	3	18.75%	15,093	15.88%	1.18	16	100.00%	95,065	100.00%	1.00

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			5,778	15.78%		4	80.00%	11,633	31.77%	2.52
Hispanic			3,501	9.56%				4,329	11.82%	
Asian			79	0.22%				215	0.59%	
Native American			97	0.26%		1	20.00%	186	0.51%	39.37
African American			43	0.12%				332	0.91%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			9	0.02%				10	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			2,728	7.45%				3,088	8.43%	
Total		0.00%	12,235	33.41%		5	100.00%	19,793	54.05%	1.85

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	4	4.30%	57,732	19.07%	0.23	64	68.82%	112,969	37.31%	1.84
Hispanic	2	2.15%	19,980	6.60%	0.33	8	8.60%	27,860	9.20%	0.93
Asian			1,352	0.45%		1	1.08%	2,725	0.90%	1.19
Native American			1,397	0.46%		1	1.08%	2,174	0.72%	1.50
African American			794	0.26%		3	3.23%	1,545	0.51%	6.32
Hawaiian/Pac Is			356	0.12%				591	0.20%	
Other/Unknown			16,332	5.39%				20,927	6.91%	
Total	6	6.45%	97,943	32.34%	0.20	77	82.80%	168,791	55.74%	1.49

Morrow and Wheeler Co. -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			2,525	18.20%				4,524	32.61%	
Hispanic			1,263	9.11%				1,460	10.53%	
Asian			15	0.11%				22	0.16%	
Native American			65	0.47%				85	0.61%	
African American			7	0.05%				8	0.06%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.03%				5	0.04%	
Other/Unknown			1,120	8.07%				1,197	8.63%	
Total		0.00%	4,999	36.04%			0.00%	7,301	52.63%	

Malheur County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			3,872	10.57%		4	80.00%	21,283	58.12%	1.38
Hispanic			269	0.73%				8,099	22.12%	
Asian			249	0.68%				543	1.48%	
Native American			13	0.04%		1	20.00%	296	0.81%	24.74
African American			9	0.02%				384	1.05%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				22	0.06%	
Other/Unknown			175	0.48%				5,991	16.36%	
Total		0.00%	4,590	12.53%		5	100.00%	36,618	100.00%	1.00

Marion County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	10	10.75%	33,787	11.16%	0.96	78	83.87%	204,488	67.53%	1.24
Hispanic			874	0.29%		10	10.75%	48,714	16.09%	0.67
Asian			332	0.11%		1	1.08%	4,409	1.46%	0.74
Native American			166	0.05%		1	1.08%	3,737	1.23%	0.87
African American			76	0.03%		3	3.23%	2,415	0.80%	4.04
Hawaiian/Pac Is			20	0.01%				967	0.32%	
Other/Unknown			825	0.27%				38,084	12.58%	
Total	10	10.75%	36,080	11.91%	0.90	93	100.00%	302,814	100.00%	1.00

Morrow and Wheeler Co. -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			1,475	10.63%				8,524	61.45%	
Hispanic			42	0.30%				2,765	19.93%	
Asian			6	0.04%				43	0.31%	
Native American			4	0.03%				154	1.11%	
African American			1	0.01%				16	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.01%				10	0.07%	
Other/Unknown			42	0.30%				2,359	17.01%	
Total		0.00%	1,571	11.33%			0.00%	13,871	100.00%	

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	12	4.94%	102,734	16.17%	0.31	152	62.55%	290,264	45.68%	1.37
Hispanic			17,548	2.76%		9	3.70%	31,100	4.89%	0.76
Asian			9,329	1.47%		7	2.88%	21,356	3.36%	0.86
Native American	1	0.41%	1,761	0.28%	1.49	4	1.65%	4,008	0.63%	2.61
African American	4	1.65%	11,804	1.86%	0.89	34	13.99%	19,144	3.01%	4.64
Hawaiian/Pac Is			738	0.12%				1,406	0.22%	
Other/Unknown			20,884	3.29%				28,841	4.54%	
Total	17	7.00%	164,798	25.93%	0.27	206	84.77%	396,119	62.33%	1.36

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			13,170	21.80%		14	77.78%	26,543	43.93%	1.77
Hispanic	1	5.56%	2,261	3.74%	1.48	1	5.56%	3,090	5.11%	1.09
Asian			169	0.28%				382	0.63%	
Native American			408	0.68%				564	0.93%	
African American			99	0.16%				142	0.24%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			44	0.07%				98	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			1,925	3.19%				2,150	3.56%	
Total	1	5.56%	18,076	29.92%	0.19	15	83.33%	32,969	54.57%	1.53

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			4,853	22.04%		11	78.57%	9,879	44.86%	1.75
Hispanic			542	2.46%				681	3.09%	
Asian			32	0.15%				72	0.33%	
Native American			113	0.51%		1	7.14%	131	0.59%	12.01
African American			19	0.09%				27	0.12%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			18	0.08%				29	0.13%	
Other/Unknown			361	1.64%				449	2.04%	
Total		0.00%	5,938	26.96%		12	85.71%	11,268	51.16%	1.68

Multnomah County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	15	6.17%	66,019	10.39%	0.59	179	73.66%	459,017	72.23%	1.02
Hispanic			959	0.15%		9	3.70%	49,607	7.81%	0.47
Asian			3,052	0.48%		7	2.88%	33,737	5.31%	0.54
Native American			298	0.05%		5	2.06%	6,067	0.95%	2.16
African American	5	2.06%	2,936	0.46%	4.45	43	17.70%	33,884	5.33%	3.32
Hawaiian/Pac Is			48	0.01%				2,192	0.34%	
Other/Unknown			1,254	0.20%				50,979	8.02%	
Total	20	8.23%	74,566	11.73%	0.70	243	100.00%	635,483	100.00%	1.00

Polk County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	11.11%	8,989	14.88%	0.75	16	88.89%	48,702	80.61%	1.10
Hispanic			129	0.21%		2	11.11%	5,480	9.07%	1.23
Asian			46	0.08%				597	0.99%	
Native American			66	0.11%				1,038	1.72%	
African American			5	0.01%				246	0.41%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			4	0.01%				146	0.24%	
Other/Unknown			133	0.22%				4,208	6.96%	
Total	2	11.11%	9,372	15.51%	0.72	18	100.00%	60,417	100.00%	1.00

Tillamook County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	2	14.29%	4,695	21.32%	0.67	13	92.86%	19,427	88.21%	1.05
Hispanic			21	0.10%				1,244	5.65%	
Asian			25	0.11%				129	0.59%	
Native American			13	0.06%		1	7.14%	257	1.17%	6.12
African American			5	0.02%				51	0.23%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				49	0.22%	
Other/Unknown			57	0.26%				867	3.94%	
Total	2	14.29%	4,818	21.88%	0.65	14	100.00%	22,024	100.00%	1.00

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	7.14%	14,567	19.59%	0.36	8	57.14%	28,205	37.93%	1.51
Hispanic			4,949	6.66%		3	21.43%	6,185	8.32%	2.58
Asian			140	0.19%				284	0.38%	
Native American			821	1.10%		1	7.14%	1,182	1.59%	4.49
African American			136	0.18%		1	7.14%	409	0.55%	12.99
Hawaiian/Pac Is			46	0.06%				69	0.09%	
Other/Unknown			3,882	5.22%				4,570	6.15%	
Total	1	7.14%	24,541	33.00%	0.22	13	92.86%	40,904	55.01%	1.69

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	1	25.00%	5,591	25.33%	0.99	3	75.00%	11,046	50.05%	1.50
Hispanic			239	1.08%				346	1.57%	
Asian			49	0.22%				136	0.62%	
Native American			61	0.28%				119	0.54%	
African American			36	0.16%				74	0.34%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			45	0.20%				101	0.46%	
Other/Unknown			264	1.20%				335	1.52%	
Total	1	25.00%	6,285	28.47%	0.88	3	75.00%	12,157	55.08%	1.36

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,656	26.29%				2,946	46.76%	
Hispanic			65	1.03%				56	0.89%	
Asian			2	0.03%				6	0.10%	
Native American			17	0.27%				27	0.43%	
African American								2	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			1	0.02%				2	0.03%	
Other/Unknown			79	1.25%				73	1.16%	
Total		0.00%	1,820	28.89%			0.00%	3,112	49.40%	

Umatilla County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			8,260	11.11%		9	64.29%	51,032	68.63%	0.94
Hispanic			232	0.31%		3	21.43%	11,366	15.29%	1.40
Asian			38	0.05%				462	0.62%	
Native American			137	0.18%		1	7.14%	2,140	2.88%	2.48
African American			24	0.03%		1	7.14%	569	0.77%	9.33
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.00%				117	0.16%	
Other/Unknown			220	0.30%				8,672	11.66%	
Total		0.00%	8,913	11.99%		14	100.00%	74,358	100.00%	1.00

Union County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			3,535	16.02%		4	100.00%	20,172	91.39%	1.09
Hispanic			15	0.07%				600	2.72%	
Asian			8	0.04%				193	0.87%	
Native American			10	0.05%				190	0.86%	
African American			8	0.04%				118	0.53%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			2	0.01%				148	0.67%	
Other/Unknown			52	0.24%				651	2.95%	
Total		0.00%	3,630	16.45%		4	100.00%	22,072	100.00%	1.00

Wallowa County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			1,352	21.46%				5,954	94.51%	
Hispanic			4	0.06%				125	1.98%	
Asian			2	0.03%				10	0.16%	
Native American			2	0.03%				46	0.73%	
African American								2	0.03%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is								3	0.05%	
Other/Unknown			8	0.13%				160	2.54%	
Total		0.00%	1,368	21.71%			0.00%	6,300	100.00%	

Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	5	7.14%	92,730	20.72%	0.34	38	54.29%	193,607	43.26%	1.25
Hispanic			18,435	4.12%		5	7.14%	30,587	6.83%	1.05
Asian	1	1.43%	7,665	1.71%	0.83	6	8.57%	17,934	4.01%	2.14
Native American	1	1.43%	823	0.18%	7.77			1,719	0.38%	
African American	2	2.86%	1,665	0.37%	7.68	6	8.57%	3,033	0.68%	12.65
Hawaiian/Pac Is			417	0.09%				801	0.18%	
Other/Unknown			16,318	3.65%				21,718	4.85%	
Total	9	12.86%	138,053	30.85%	0.42	55	78.57%	269,399	60.20%	1.31

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian	3	25.00%	19,516	22.94%	1.09	6	50.00%	37,980	44.63%	1.12
Hispanic			3,482	4.09%				5,357	6.30%	
Asian			183	0.22%				569	0.67%	
Native American			419	0.49%				676	0.79%	
African American			132	0.16%				564	0.66%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			26	0.03%				65	0.08%	
Other/Unknown			2,567	3.02%				3,400	4.00%	
Total	3	25.00%	26,325	30.94%	0.81	6	50.00%	48,611	57.13%	0.88

Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco, Sherman and Gilliam) -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Under 18					Between 18 and 64				
	Served		Census		CA Ratio	Served		Census		CA Ratio
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc		Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	
Caucasian			9,657	19.37%		5	83.33%	18,544	37.20%	2.24
Hispanic			3,153	6.32%				4,163	8.35%	
Asian			98	0.20%				228	0.46%	
Native American			459	0.92%				544	1.09%	
African American			64	0.13%		1	16.67%	105	0.21%	79.14
Hawaiian/Pac Is			54	0.11%				76	0.15%	
Other/Unknown			2,368	4.75%				2,903	5.82%	
Total		0.00%	15,853	31.80%		6	100.00%	26,563	53.28%	1.88

Washington County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	6	8.57%	37,018	8.27%	1.04	49	70.00%	323,355	72.26%	0.97
Hispanic			713	0.16%		5	7.14%	49,735	11.11%	0.64
Asian			1,453	0.32%		7	10.00%	27,052	6.04%	1.65
Native American			83	0.02%		1	1.43%	2,625	0.59%	2.44
African American			128	0.03%		8	11.43%	4,826	1.08%	10.60
Hawaiian/Pac Is			28	0.01%				1,246	0.28%	
Other/Unknown			641	0.14%				38,677	8.64%	
Total	6	8.57%	40,064	8.95%	0.96	70	100.00%	447,516	100.00%	1.00

Yamhill County -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian	3	25.00%	9,717	11.42%	2.19	12	100.00%	67,213	78.99%	1.27
Hispanic			178	0.21%				9,017	10.60%	
Asian			45	0.05%				797	0.94%	
Native American			47	0.06%				1,142	1.34%	
African American			17	0.02%				713	0.84%	
Hawaiian/Pac Is			7	0.01%				98	0.12%	
Other/Unknown			144	0.17%				6,111	7.18%	
Total	3	25.00%	10,155	11.93%	2.09	12	100.00%	85,091	100.00%	1.00

Mid-Columbia (Hood River, Wasco,
 Sherman and Gilliam) -- Calendar Year 2003

OPRCS - St Hosp Long Term

Ethnicity	Over 65					Total				
	Served		Census		CA	Served		Census		CA
	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio	Pop	Perc	Pop	Perc	Ratio
Caucasian			6,976	13.99%		5	83.33%	35,177	70.56%	1.18
Hispanic			134	0.27%				7,450	14.94%	
Asian			111	0.22%				437	0.88%	
Native American			68	0.14%				1,071	2.15%	
African American			13	0.03%		1	16.67%	182	0.37%	45.66
Hawaiian/Pac Is			3	0.01%				133	0.27%	
Other/Unknown			135	0.27%				5,406	10.84%	
Total		0.00%	7,440	14.92%		6	100.00%	49,856	100.00%	1.00

Practitioner Reports Summary Table

Agency/MHO	Staff Name	Degree-Prof Credentials	QMHP/A Status	Contract/ Employed	Hours Worked	Reported by County	Staff Specialty
Accountable BH Assn	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cascadia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No--See Note 1	Yes/No--See Note 2
Note 1--Reported by affiliated agency; Note 2--Reported for some, not all agencies							
Clackamas Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No--See Note 1	Yes
Greater Oregon BHI	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
LaneCare	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No--See Note 3	Yes
Note 3--Reported by affiliated agency							
Mid-Valley BCN	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington Co. MHO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No--See Note 4	Yes/No--See Note 5
Note 4--Reported by affiliated agency Note 5--Reported by language some sites, by practice some sites							

Source: Annual Service Practitioner Reports, by MHO, OMHAS, 2004, two reports not available.

<u>Agency/MHO</u>	<u>Examples of Specialties Reported</u>
Accountable BH Assn	Children, adults, elders, families, dual diagnosis, skills training, Crisis , Psycho-social Rehab, SPMI, Gambling, juvenile rehab, parenting, FSAT, Anger management, Suicide prevention, developmental disorders, eating disorders, grief and trauma,
Cascadia	Family therapy, Asian Cultural Svcs, Early Childhood, IOPS, Crisis, Latino Culture, Adolescents, Art Therapy, Drug & Alcohol, Spanish Language, Family Focused, Foster Children, Skill Builder, Sex Offender Tx
Clackamas Co.	Adults, Children, Adults & Children, Geriatric, Marriage & Family, Polygraph, Criminal Justice, Foster Parent, Individual Skills Training
Greater Oregon BHI	Children, General, Seniors, Early Intervention, Adolescents, DBT, Dual Diagnosis, Skills Training, SPMI, Adults, Depression, Therapist, Resident manager, Voc, Women's Issues, Play Therapy, Spanish, Respite Care, Hispanic Serv, 3
LaneCare	Child, Adult, SPMI, Adolescent, Family Counseling, Sex Offender Tx, CMI, Depression, Social Work, Mental Health Nurse, Nursing, Dual Diagnosis, Spanish-speaking, Ed/Rehab Counseling, Psychology, CADC, Skills Training, Treatment Foster Parent, Family Resource Aide, Treatment Team Member, Treatment Team Aide
Mid-Valley BCN	Adults, SPMI Crisis, Children, Geriatric, Adolescents, Med Management, Drug and Alcohol, Domestic Violence, Psychological Evaluations, Grief, Anxiety, Screener--ED Svc, Deaf, Hard of Hearing, PTSD, ADHD, Crisis Associate
Washington Co. MHO	Languages --Mien, Cambodian, Bosnian, Hispanic, Vietnamese, Kurdish, Lao, Ethiopian, Somali, Russian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, Tagala (sic), Farsi Practices --Child, Adult, Older Adult, Adolescent

Source: Annual Service Practitioner Reports, by MHO, OMHAS, 2004, two reports not available.

Detailed Summary of Selected Key Informant Responses

What are the barriers to service?

Among the most frequently identified barriers were:

1. Stigma and difference in understanding of mental health and substance abuse treatment among racial/ethnic minorities and providers of service, including lack of familiarity with availability of services and the need to offer services such that racial/ethnic people will relate to them
2. Lack of linguistically competent and clinically trained practitioners to serve specialized service needs
3. The need to engage potential service consumers by focusing first on basic human needs such as housing, employment, and health care prior to focusing on mental health or substance abuse treatment through active outreach efforts.

The following statements are representative of other responses:

- When services are acceptable, there is a waiting list.
- Substance abuse and mental health jobs don't pay very well; when younger people want to move from rural to urban communities, there is a talent drain.
- Training funds are limited; universities aren't training to meet the needs.
- The local racial/ethnic community isn't organized. That makes it difficult to work with knowledgeable leadership of the community who are invested in solutions.
- The system is cold, formal and intimidating. The consumer doesn't feel welcomed. Families have to search for services rather than find them readily available. Families that have been turned down or were unsuccessful in getting service once won't come back.
- Outreach and outstations are needed where people attend church at health clinics and at other community based agencies.
- We need to sub-contract services to community based organizations to develop additional service capacity.
- Professionals aren't trained to be culturally competent. Diagnostic and assessment tools are standardized for the general population.
- Community agencies often drop responsibility to serve consumers when it appears another agency is involved. There is a lack of coordination of services and responsibility at some agencies.

- There aren't enough people of color in policy making and upper management positions at counties and the state level.
- Policies set in urban settings often are not developed in consultation with rural practitioners.

What might be done of a tangible nature to address the barriers?

Responses to this question were grouped into four categories: Staffing, Administration, Clinical Approaches and Community Involvement. The responses below are reflective of the solutions put forth by key informants.

Staffing

The state needs to take a leadership role in assuring that there are sufficient levels of staff available to meet the specialized needs.

We need to develop a work force for the future. We should develop professionals from their community of origin.

It is important to hire and train bilingual, bicultural staff. Some organizations are "growing their own", using in-house methods to recruit, train and retain staff at paraprofessional and professional service delivery levels.

Respondents also said it was important to recruit and retain bilingual and bicultural direct service staff at provider agencies. They also said it is important to recruit and retain bilingual, bicultural staff at agency, county and state level management and administrative levels.

One organization reported providing training for staff who answer the phone to help them be more customer service oriented.

Recruitment should be targeted in other areas of the country where there may be greater availability of trained bilingual, bicultural staff.

Students who are placed in clinical and administrative internship positions need to come from more diverse groups.

One organization pays a salary differential for staff that is culturally competent.

Administration

State and federal funding must be used to assure that linguistic and culturally competent services are available. Funding allocations should have provisions to assure equal access to service. Agencies that know how to provide health and other human services to minority communities are not as well established in delivering

mental health and substance abuse services. They often don't receive funds for this.

The state should include geographic distance in its funding formula. There needs to be more funding for indigent services and more flexible funding in serving children.

OMHAS should require that a percentage of funds must be earmarked directly to providers with a history of successful provision of services, with specific outcomes attached to contracts.

OMHAS needs to assure that ethnic demographic and service data is reviewed at the state and local level. The data should be the basis to determine where adjustments in services need to be made.

The state needs to take more leadership in standards, training and clinical practice. Oregon Administrative Regulations ought to be examined for changes to promote better access and clinical standards. OMHAS needs to assure that policies and procedures as well as service standards are developed and put in place.

OMHAS should provide technical assistance to mainstream and community based agencies in the provision of culturally competent services. OMHAS should conduct workshops for minority community based organizations to bid on services.

The state should assess training needs and assure that training to provide culturally competent services is provided

Counties need to be held accountable for how funds are distributed to assure equal access to services. Mainstream providers must be accountable for serving all populations.

Performance based contracts are needed. They should promote the development of minority service programs and providers.

Providers should be culturally competent. Some providers should be culturally specific, and services should be delivered by community based minority agencies.

Clinical Approaches

It's important to have conditions in clinics that will be more inviting to people, starting at the front desk.

The attitude of clinicians should be open to understanding cultural differences and being non-judgmental.

Clinicians should ask about patient concepts of illness and processes of healing. There need to be culturally competent methods of accurate diagnosis.

Clinicians need to be willing and able to explain variations in services to consumers on their own terms.

Some cultures have deference to authority, but they still like to know what is going on.

There should be bilingual, bicultural staff.

Liaisons should be developed within communities to include working relationships with indigenous healers.

Develop diagnostic tools and assure assessment of cultural and family strengths as well as community strengths.

Behavioral differences aren't viewed in light of cultural differences and transitions from immigration. We need to spend more time on transitions rather than on emphasizing sick, pathological focus.

Community Involvement

Outreach to diverse communities needs to occur.

Communities need to be involved in planning services they might use.

Mainstream providers need guidance from culturally specific providers and professionals to serve people from specific groups.

Information should be provided to other community agencies where minority groups gather and work. Affiliated service providers and school personnel should be taught about variations in behavioral and diagnostic categories.

There needs to be coalition building among the diverse communizes and shared knowledge as programs are developed.

Parent involvement should be assured and likely increased at every level of decision making.

Who might be responsible to address the barriers?

Policy makers are responsible to make changes.

This needs to be a multi-system approach. Purse holders have a responsibility to form standards and measurements. Provider management and boards need to commit resources and assure they are targeted.

OMHAS would have the lead in general, and OMAP would have it for children with open cards.

OMHAS is responsible to address the disparities by clearly stating that counties have a mandate to provide demonstrated access. There are no apparent staff people at OMHAS responsible to work with counties to do this.

OMHAS should track ethnic and racial data and establish target outcomes that measure access and results. Consumer satisfaction information needs to be tracked by race and ethnicity.

Community leaders from respective minority groups need to participate in shaping policy and practice. Those leaders also need to help their communities endorse services and create feedback loops, informing providers and funders about how things are working.

A small community based organization that specializes in other services doesn't become a mental health provider easily. The structural considerations are difficult to meet. MHOs and OMHAS need to provide assistance and support to new providers to assure sufficient capacity to serve.

At least one MHO has done training and promotes work force development. Others also should do that. MHO contractors should be trying to employ people who are professionals from various cultures.

Administrators are responsible to address barriers, but clinicians are responsible to learn new techniques.

All service providers and case managers need to have basic knowledge in cultural competence. The system needs to identify who has specialized expertise and utilize them as resources to providers without it.

The system also needs to develop and implement qualifications to work with special families. We need to get mental health people into our schools. Special education staff needs more support.

The university level education system needs to develop curriculum changes to address varied service needs.

The person who helps to make changes locally needs to be a person who is well known and respected in the community. Merchants, clergy and elders should be involved in devising solutions.

Maybe affirmative action needs to be brought back.

Are there current efforts that your agency is making to improve service capacity for the various population groups?

When OMHAS offers training, they try to make sure that there are funds for minority and rural communities. OMHAS is developing distant learning opportunities in alcohol and drug and mental health.

One organization monitors the number of new clients seen on a monthly basis by age and ethnicity. The same organization matches consumers with staff who can best meet their needs.

One area has a tribal program with specialized treatment services, but community children aren't eligible to access it. The agency is working on development of a community youth residential program. They are also waiting on leadership in the Hispanic community to help them determine what is needed and to help develop service capacity.

Some of the colleges are developing related training courses on line.

One agency has developed a business plan to expand service capacity. The plan is to have teams of community health workers and licensed clinical therapists engage the community.

The same agency holds community groups that are educational in nature but which provide for assessments for mental health and substance abuse to be conducted and referrals for service to be made.

A model similar to Incredible Years is being developed.

More than one agency is "growing their own". They have in-house methods to recruit and train direct service staff to meet the needs of minority consumers.

One agency that uses the "grow your own" model also has sought and gained access to federal grant funding. It also has targeted increased capacity to serve children and families through a process improvement grant.

An affiliated agency, that doesn't deliver mental health services, still provides recommendations about service needs of the target population to mental health providers. They are developing continuing education programs for direct service staff that address practices changes. Those involve specialized counseling skills.

One organization has multiple efforts taking place. There is a cultural relations department and a strategic plan to develop cultural competence that has been endorsed by management and the organization's board of directors.

The organization has a very active cultural relations committee that monitors and implements the cultural competence plan. There is a team of cultural specialists staffed by a group of multi-ethnic mental health specialists that provide direct services, training and consultation to other staff in the organization.

The same organization employs a limited English proficient coordinator who is responsible to track and review incidents within the agency related to language and service provision.

Direct service and other personnel receive training in delivering culturally competent services. Training is specific to particular minority groups. The organization provides and supports culturally specific programming for African Americans in-house and for Latinos through a multi-agency project in the community.

The organization produces a quarterly report of ethnic clients served and ethnic staff who serve them. Goals for improvement are formulated based on results of the reports.

Another agency has used paid practicum placements to promote additional development of qualified service staff.

Still another agency has begun to establish partnerships with a community based health clinic. The mental health agency hires staff and stations them at a satellite office within the health clinic, where clients are more likely to access and accept services. The agency is also involved in using a "braided care" approach to delivery of services. Clinicians are able to access funds from various sources to provide support and assistance to mental health clients.

The number of bilingual professionals is tracked, and gradual improvement has been recognized elsewhere. Penetration rates also are monitored and have increased gradually. There are bi-monthly specialized staff team meetings.

One respondent reported that they are partnering with organizations that specialize in serving minority populations. They are working with them to help build local resources. They have approached on community based minority agency that has a solid connection to the local minority community but that doesn't have expertise in

providing mental health services. They are trying to start a support group for families of various ethnic backgrounds in that part of the state.

There is an alcohol and drug abuse intensive outpatient and residential program in Spanish for men. The program has served people from 26 counties to date.

An agency hired an outside consultant to help them be more culturally competent and diverse. Implementation of the recommendations is pending.

What efforts are other individuals or agencies making to improve service capacity for the various population groups? What are the other efforts?

There are several specialized community based agencies in Multnomah County that target American Indian adults and youth, Hispanic, Asian, and refugee communities for delivery of mental health and substance abuse services, all on an outpatient basis.

An urban American Indian program has developed capacity to identify employment opportunities for their target population.

A multi-agency effort to serve the Latino population was cited. Four agencies dedicated to serving Latinos have joined to develop mental health service delivery capacity.

Some mental health providers are using mentoring and internships to develop staff capability.

There are some Latino centers like the ones in Eugene, Salem and Hillsboro areas. They don't provide mental health services, but they know about their community.

There are small, non-profit community agencies emerging in various parts of the state. They tend to focus on broader social service needs and economic development but are considered a potential resource.

A family to family training program was designed by NAMI and has been translated into Spanish. An affiliated agency uses a Spanish language curriculum to teach families about the dynamics of mental health.

The Department of Children and Families has spent a lot of time considering issues related to serving special populations and working with their contractors to improve their performance.

A methamphetamine task force has been convened in one county. The task force includes faith based, corrections and treatment providers to address this drug

problem. City, county and tribal goals are the same, and they are looking for coordinated solutions

Health care clinics have developed partnerships with mental health providers and have established limited independent internal mental health service capacity.

Some Health Departments have provided health care through bilingual, bicultural staff.

There is a research project at the University of Oregon in Eugene that is learning about American Indian teen-agers.

A school district started a charter school, and local tribal youth have benefited from that.

In one eastern Oregon location, the Oregon Youth Authority and medical professionals have come together in community meetings to coordinate and improve youth services.

How will your agency know whether and when sufficient service capacity has been established?

Indirect Indicators

There should be diverse representation on policy and decision making groups and governing bodies.

The methamphetamine problem would be cut in half.

There wouldn't be long waiting lists for treatment services.

When you can walk into a mental health place and know that you can get the help you need, we'll be there.

Recovery celebrations will have even more people participating.

Maybe we will know when we don't have to turn people away.

We should be able to see that there are more participants in community based programs.

We should be able to know when penetration rates are comparable between mainstream and other communities.

It's difficult to know when services are sufficient, because there are people who don't access services and population groups that are under-estimated.

Data Based Indicators

Outcome data from indicators such as high end services like crisis hospitals and jails will be comparable across groups.

Services will be sufficient when we see outcomes that are fairly equitable. If 13% of the mainstream population has favorable access and outcomes, we should expect to see comparable results for minority populations.

We try to match census data with service data. We also have outcome measures to help us determine our progress.

If hospitalization is low but alternatives to hospitalization are high, we are doing a good job.

The agency has reviewed recruitment, retention and promotion within the agency. They have also reviewed how they should collaborate with their partners.

We should expect that the service and administrative workforce should be representative of the groups in the community.

Consumer Satisfaction Indicators

A good measure would be going to the minority community leadership and they indicated satisfaction with the level of service capacity. Data is objective and doesn't indicate satisfaction or appropriateness.

Satisfaction surveys and other indicators directly from the communities are good indicators.

We will know when there are no complaints from families and when people seek services on their own.

It wouldn't work just to do a satisfaction survey. People may not even be there to survey if they weren't served well in the first place.

Focus groups have to be employed.

Are you aware of any culturally competent emerging or best practices?

Concepts

Some respondents were concerned about implementation of best practices. The current momentum to adopt them seems to assume that anything not identified as best practice isn't a good practice.

Best practice involves folks who are culturally aware and involve families and a broader social network like friends and clergy.

There aren't many emerging and best culturally competent practices, but they will be starting because of funding requirements.

Emerging Practices

One of the respondents reported that everybody at the agency gets a cultural inventory at intake.

There is a crisis center that has services available in Spanish and bicultural staff.

A multi-ethnic team of cultural specialists has been in operation well over two years. They provide short term and crisis intervention services, conduct training for general practitioners and offer consultation to practitioners who are serving racial/ethnic minority individuals.

At least one substance abuse provider has developed intensive outpatient and residential treatment services for men in Spanish.

One organization has a grant to document the work of their African American dual diagnosis grant. The funds are specifically to establish a promising practice.

The *promotora* model appears to have some research emerging.

The peer support model is starting to be used.

Use of flex funds is thought to be a best practice.

Treatment is value based. Consumers are encouraged to walk their own values. When we look at evidence based practice in minority communities, Talking Circles is one effective practice, but it's not an officially recognized practice. Sweat lodges are also successful. Another is Back to the Boards, use of traditional baby boards for Native communities. Some people are using challenge courses, and others have adopted rights of passage programs that help youth come of age and be influenced

and supported by their elders. At least one tribe is using the Family Unity model, where families decide what is best for them and have wraparound services.

One emerging model is combined work with community workers and professional mental health therapists doing intensive community engagement, educational forms and informal assessments and referrals.

Related and Collaborative Efforts

Use of cultural competence plans within an agency is an emerging but undocumented practice.

Some community based providers are beginning to develop mental health and substance abuse services.

Some programs have begun to translate and adapt established interventions into other languages.

Collaborative efforts among community based organizations and established mental health agencies to develop and deliver services to target populations is an emerging practice.

Placement of mental health workers at outstation locations such as health clinics and other community based sites is becoming more common.

One agency has a limited English proficient coordinator who tracks and reviews incidents within the agency related to language and service provision.

Community Involvement

Use of NAMI translated curriculum materials is one step.

Families are working with provider staff to design individual service plans.

The state family networks put together a book on the subject of cultural competence within the last year. The subject of the statewide family network in June 2005 was cultural competence.

Is there anything else you think is important to know about mental health and related services to children and ethnic minority populations in your county or service area?

One of the things that would make a huge difference is for DHS to assist communities to develop real partnerships. DHS should promote, encourage and support local partnerships to increase use of limited dollars.

It's urgent that the state (OMHAS) be taking seriously and putting priority on the needs of people in light of changing demographics. Service to minority groups has been an add-on. It needs to be part of core services even if it means cutting back services to others who have had more of an advantage.

We need a fully developed drug court. They are starting to emerge, but the progress is slow, because there isn't any funding for it.

When we think of systems of care, what do we consider to be essential elements? Does this perspective include natural helpers? That includes indigenous healers. We create systems of care with formal providers, but we don't include spiritual, recreational, socialization and meaningful employment in the equation. One of the best predictors of good health is a good job, including good benefits. We need to see that in our service delivery.

Who does the state have for advisors? Do they have a representative group of people helping to share policy?

Biographical Statement C.H. "Hank" Balderrama

C. H. Hank Balderrama has specialized in cultural competency since 1977. He is one of the founders and was the first executive director of Consejo and of Counseling Referral Service in Seattle in 1978, an agency that continues to provide mental health and other social services to serve a target population of Hispanics. He has worked extensively in the area of clinical and organizational cultural competence in urban and rural settings since then.

Mr. Balderrama was co-chair of a national panel that developed standards of care for Latinos in a managed care mental health environment through a project sponsored by the Substance Abuse, Mental Health Services Administration. He has been a senior program administrator for the Washington State Mental Health Division since March, 1989 and is assigned to promote cultural competence. He formulates policy and provides leadership to headquarters, state hospitals, regional contractors and mental health centers in the areas of client services, community involvement, training and education, hiring and contracting.

He has consulted independently. He has served as keynote speaker and workshop presenter at numerous state and regional conferences. In 2004 and 2005 he worked with the Multnomah County Mental Health and Addiction Services Division in Portland, Oregon, where he facilitated development of a cultural competence plan while the system was in transition to a capitated payment system. His focus was on increasing and improving systems capacity to serve racial/ethnic minorities,. One result was "Implementing Cultural Competence, An Action Plan for Multnomah County".

Since 2003, he has consulted monthly with Cascadia Behavioral Health in Portland, providing clinical and consultative skills development to a cadre of multi-cultural staff, helping to set the foundation for evidence based practice. His contract with the Oregon Office of Mental Health and Abuse Services for this report is to develop baseline systems capacity to serve racial/ethnic minorities in various regions of the state and to develop recommendations to establish incremental increased service capacity.

His contact information is:

C. H. "Hank" Balderrama
Human Service Consultant, LLC
30435 – 23rd Avenue S.W.
Federal Way, WA 98023

(206) 579-5382 voice
(253) 835-4340 fax
eltmal@yahoo.com