



**Pacific Grove Police Department
2004 Community Survey**

Final Report

*Jan Roehl, Ph.D.
Justice Research Center
Pacific Grove, California*

The points of view expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Pacific Grove Police Department.

Pacific Grove Police Department: 2004 Community Policing Survey
Final Report
by
Jan Roehl, Ph.D.

The Pacific Grove Police Department embraces the philosophy of community policing, which emphasizes solving chronic problems and preventing crime through partnerships among the police, citizens, businesses, city agencies, schools, and other significant stakeholders. A key component of this approach to policing is community participation in identifying problems of concern and devising collaborative, long-term solutions to those problems.

In mid-2004, the PG Police Department (PGPD) conducted a community survey to learn about concerns citizens and business owners may have about the city, their impressions of the PG police department, and their thoughts about community policing. The survey is a significant step in soliciting the community's views on problems, public safety, and police performance.

This report presents the complete results of the survey. A draft report was prepared for the police command staff in late 2004, and the results were presented to the Pacific Grove City Council on January 19, 2005. Local print and TV media covered the story, providing the wider public with a summary of the results and comments by Chief Miller.

Survey Methodology

Development of the survey began in early 2004, with the formation of an advisory committee composed of Chief Carl Miller, then Councilmember Sue Renz, Dr. Jan Roehl, Ms. Carmelita Garcia, Mr. John Fischer, Mr. Jim Flammer, and Mr. Michael Adamson, Chamber of Commerce representative (the Chamber also assisted with the survey mailing). The questionnaire was developed after studying similar surveys in other jurisdictions and adding items specific to Pacific Grove.

10,000 questionnaires were mailed in mid-July 2004 to all Pacific Grove residences (n=7,705), post office box numbers (n=2,024), and businesses (n=520) via the local Postmaster (these add up to 10,249 addresses, and who didn't get the 249 shortfall is unknown). The Postmaster estimates that half of the post office boxes are maintained by people who have a residence in town, and that half of the business addresses also represent those who have post office boxes or PG residences. Thus, the total number of possible respondents is about 8,740.

Completed questionnaires were returned with prepaid postage to the post office, then delivered to the independent Justice Research Center for data entry and analysis. 2,117 completed questionnaires were returned, for a very respectable return rate of 24%.

Who Responded to the Survey?

Information on the respondents to the survey is presented in Table 1. The vast majority of the respondents (94%) were residents, representing 26% of the city's residences. 131 business

owners also responded, representing 25% of the city's businesses.

A sizable proportion of the survey respondents were senior citizens, with 41% over 60 years of age. The survey was not intended to capture the views of those under 18, and doesn't. A teacher at PG High School asked her class to complete the survey, and those students account for most of the respondents under 18.

In comparison to all city residents, as reported by the 2000 census, the respondents to the survey are a bit older, on average, and include a slightly greater number of women and slightly fewer minorities. Yet all in all, the demographics of the respondents correspond well to the city's population.

The survey's age categories do not match those used by the U.S. Census Bureau exactly. According to the 2000 census, PG's residents fell into these age groups:

<u>Age</u>	<u>% of city</u>
20-24	5%
25-34	14%
35-44	20%
45-54	24%
55-59	8%
60+	24%

Table 1: Survey Respondent and City Demographics

Demographic	Survey respondents* (n=2112)	City population** (n=15,522)
<u>Age:</u> Under 18	19 (1%)	2,766 (18%)
18-29	77 (4)	
30-39	180 (9)	[see text]
40-49	375 (18)	
50-59	541 (27)	
60 or older	840 (41)	3,725 (24)
[preferred not to answer]	57 (3)	
<u>Gender:</u> Female	1,093 (59)	8,355 (54)
Male	759 (41)	7,167 (46)
[preferred not to answer]	101 (5)	
<u>Race:</u> Yes, Spanish/Hispanic/Latino	66 (3)	1,108 (7)
White	1,682 (91)	13,665 (88)
Black or African American	11 (1)	177 (1)
Amer. Indian or Alaska native	3 (<1)	86 (1)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4 (<1)	41 (<1)
Asian	78 (4)	698 (5)
Some other race	32 (2)	276 (2)
Two or more races	35 (2)	579 (4)
[preferred not to answer]	185 (9)	
<u>Resident or Business owner/manager?</u>		
Resident	1,951 (94)	
Business owner/manager	95 (5)	
Both	36 (2)	

* Percentages are based on those who answered the question.

** Based on 2000 U.S. Census data.

59% of the survey respondents were female, and 41% were male, compared to 54% and 46%, respectively, among the city's population. 91% of the respondents reported they were White, 4% reported they were Asian, and the remaining 5% were other races or two or more races. Comparable figures for the city's population are 88% White, 5% Asian, and 7% other races or two or more races. 3% of the respondents identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino, compared to 7% of the population.

Results

Respondent perceptions of problems in Pacific Grove. Respondents rated the seriousness of 16 specified problems in Pacific Grove; the results are presented in Table 2 on the following page.

Number 1 on the list of perceived problems is traffic issues, covering speeding, parking, and other traffic issues, with an average rating of 2.87 (out of 5 maximum). A third of the respondents gave traffic a 4 or 5 rating. Problems with juveniles and underage drinking rank second and third. Number 4 on the list is the "destruction of our natural beauty and resources," followed by vandalism and drug dealing. At this level, 18% gave the problem of drug dealing a 4 or 5 rating, and 37% gave it a "1," meaning "not a problem."

Noise or other disturbances ranked #7 out of the 16 problems. Respondents were given space to describe the noise or disturbances, and the first two answers of each respondent replying were recorded. 761 responses were recorded from 628 (30%) respondents. Of these, 12% concerned speeding and 5% concerned parking issues, not noise and other disturbances. The noise problems listed by the respondents are, in order:

Traffic noise, primarily motorcycles, loud cars, trucks, and buses	141 (22%)
Music, parties, kids, neighbor noise	117 (19%)
Barking dogs	116 (19%)
Car radios/boom cars	82 (13%)
Other noises (sirens, skateboarders, etc.)	70 (11%)
Leaf blowers, gardening tools	53 (8%)
Construction, power tools	48 (8%)

The biggest *single* noise problem (the first two categories above are compilations of individual complaints) is barking dogs. Cars with booming music, motorcycles, and leaf blowers are next highest on the list of individual noise problems.

Burglary from homes or businesses and fraud, identity and Internet crimes tied for 8th on the list. Number 10 is loitering, with nearly half of the respondents saying it was "not a problem." Gang activity, child abuse, and vice crimes were ranked the lowest of PG's problems.

Differences in ratings of problems among respondents of different ages, genders, races, and neighborhoods were analyzed, along with residents and business owners. There were some statistically significant differences between groups. Of the 16 problems rated, 11 of them indicated significantly different ratings by different age groups. Young people under 18¹ ranked juvenile problems and underage drinking around the midpoint (2.36-2.58), higher than did those in their 20s and 30s, and more in line with the ratings of those 40 and older. Juveniles gave the

¹All information reported for juveniles should be interpreted cautiously, as it is based on a small number of individuals under 18.

Table 2: Perceptions of problems in Pacific Grove

Average rating	Problem/issue (listed in order of perceived seriousness)	Frequency (percentage)				
		1 Not a problem	2	3	4	5 A big problem
2.87	k. Traffic issues (speeding, parking, etc.).	411 (20)	450 (22)	479 (24)	322 (16)	349 (17)
2.52	d. Other juvenile problems (loitering, etc.).	510 (26)	509 (26)	516 (26)	272 (14)	158 (8)
2.51	c. Underage drinking.	553 (28)	471 (24)	478 (25)	281 (14)	170 (9)
2.31	o. Destruction of natural beauty/resources.	683 (35)	533 (27)	390 (20)	229 (12)	147 (7)
2.29	h. Vandalism.	575 (29)	630 (32)	445 (23)	222 (11)	85 (4)
2.24	f. Buying and selling illegal drugs.	700 (37)	507 (27)	355 (19)	216 (11)	126 (7)
2.15	l. Noise or other disturbances.	780 (41)	515 (27)	294 (15)	180 (9)	140 (7)
2.06	b. Theft/burglaries from homes or businesses.	712 (37)	635 (33)	425 (22)	116 (6)	55 (3)
2.06	p. Fraud, identity theft, and Internet crime.	802 (42)	523 (27)	344 (18)	143 (8)	99 (5)
1.93	a. Theft of cars or break-in of cars.	858 (43)	633 (32)	336 (17)	98 (5)	60 (3)
1.86	j. Loitering.	946 (48)	579 (29)	276 (14)	108 (6)	59 (3)
1.85	i. Abandoned cars.	996 (50)	566 (28)	247 (12)	111 (6)	77 (4)
1.75	n. Exploitation or abuse of the elderly.	998 (53)	515 (28)	229 (12)	85 (5)	45 (2)
1.71	e. Gang activity.	1097 (56)	531 (27)	205 (11)	64 (3)	62 (3)
1.61	m. Exploitation/abuse/molesting of children.	1138 (60)	483 (26)	179 (10)	44 (2)	44 (2)
1.46	g. Vice (gambling, prostitution, etc.)	1314 (68)	425 (22)	147 (8)	29 (2)	22 (1)

highest ratings of all age groups to gang activity, vice, loitering, and child and elder abuse. Older people were more concerned with traffic issues, vandalism, noise disturbances, and the destruction of natural resources.

Men and women rated half of the problems differently, with women giving higher ratings to problems than men. Because of the small numbers of minorities, statistical tests were run comparing the views of all minorities to all whites. Few differences were found. The only statistical difference was found in the groups' perceptions of the problem of destruction of natural beauty/resources, which whites rated higher than minorities.

Residents and business owners rated problems similarly, except for drug dealing, which rated more highly by the residents. Differences among Pacific Grove's 17 neighborhoods were also examined. Of the 16 problems, there were statistical differences among the views of respondents in different neighborhoods in regard to five of the problems: burglary, drug dealing, abandoned cars, loitering, and fraud, identify theft, and Internet crime. The three neighborhoods whose residents rated each of these problems the lowest and highest are listed below:

Burglary Lowest: 1st addition, 3rd addition, Pacific Grove Acres
Highest: Hillcrest, Seaview, Asilomar Dunes

Drug dealing: Lowest: 1st addition, Retreat area, The Glen
Highest: Hillcrest, Asilomar Dunes, Seaview

Abandoned cars: Lowest: 1st addition, Country Club Gate, Country Club Heights
Highest: The Glen, Del Monte Park, Seaview

Loitering: Lowest: 1st addition, Country Club Heights, Hillcrest
Highest: 4th addition, The Glen, 2nd addition

Fraud, identity theft, Internet crime:
Lowest: The Glen, 1st addition, 2nd addition
Highest: 4th addition, Asilomar Dunes, Country Club Gate

Perceptions of safety in Pacific Grove. The vast majority of the respondents reported they feel very safe in Pacific Grove during the day – 85% reported they feel “very safe,” a score of 1 out of 5 (see Table 3). When asked where they feel unsafe during the day, the areas, in order, are (1) the rec trail (mentioned 32 times), (2) a variety of areas due to traffic problems (mentioned 27 times), and (3) specific neighborhood areas (26 times).

Respondents also feel quite safe after dark, with 43% reporting they feel “very safe,” a score of 1 out of 5, and another 35% reporting a 2 out of 5. However, just over half of the respondents (55%) said there were areas in Pacific Grove where they did not feel safe, primarily after dark. The rec trail was the number one place where residents feel unsafe after dark, mentioned by 612 respondents.

Average rating	Question	Frequency (and percentage)				
		1 Very safe	2	3	4	5 Not safe at all
1.20	a. How safe do you feel in PG during the day?	1778 (85)	224 (11)	60 (3)	18 (1)	6 (<1)
1.87	b. How safe do you feel in PG at night?	895 (43)	717 (35)	322 (16)	91 (4)	41 (2)

Where people feel unsafe at night:

Rec trail	612 (49%)
Beach areas, particularly Asilomar and Lover's Point	208 (17%)
Parks, especially Arnett, George Washington, and Lover's Point	83 (7%)
Other areas not listed below	79 (6%)
Dark streets and alleys	69 (6%)
Specific neighborhood areas (Arkwright/Moreland, Del Monte Park, near high school, several others)	69 (6%)
Specific commercial areas (Country Club Center, grocery store parking lots, several others)	51 (4%)
Wooded areas	23 (2%)
Places where the mountain lion may be	21 (2%)
Areas unsafe due to traffic	16 (1%)
Downtown generally	10 (1%)

Respondents were asked whether their neighborhoods had become safer and better places to live or work during the past year (Table 4). The majority (over 80%) said their neighborhoods had remained about the same; their other comments point to the conclusions that the neighborhoods haven't changed, they are generally safe and good. Those who think there has been a change are split. Nine percent said their neighborhoods had become less safe, and 8% said they had become worse places to live or work. About the same number said their neighborhoods had become more safe, and more (12%) said they were better.

Table 4: Neighborhood Safety and Improvement

Over the past year, would you say your neighborhood has become a safer place to live (or work), a less safe place to live (or work), or has it stayed about the same?

Safer: 173 (8%)
 Less safe: 178 (9%)
 About the same: 1723 (83%)

Over the past year, would you say your neighborhood has become a better place to live (or work), a worse place to live (or work), or has it stayed about the same?

Better: 254 (12%)
 Worse: 164 (8%)
 About the same: 1649 (80%)

No statistically significant differences were found among age groups, although juveniles and 20-somethings reported the highest ratings of feeling unsafe during the day (1.32 and 1.23), followed by those over 60 (1.21). The highest ratings of fear after dark were reported by people in their 40s, those over 60, and juveniles.

Women reported feeling more unsafe after dark than men do (1.95 vs 1.70, significant at .00). Minorities, as a group, feel less safe during the day, on average (1.32) than whites (average = 1.17). Perceptions of safety after dark were nearly identical between the two groups.

There were no statistical differences in perceptions of safety between residents and business owners. There were also no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of safety among respondents in different neighborhoods.

Views of the Pacific Grove Police Department's responsibilities and performance.

Respondents to the survey were asked about their views of the main responsibilities of the police department; their answers appear in Table 5a. Crime prevention was ranked the most important

responsibility of the police, placed in the top three by 81% of the respondents. The second and third most important responsibilities are, respectively, maintaining peace and order (checked by 62%) and traffic control and enforcement (48%).

Table 5a: Priorities for the PG Police Department

What do you think the top three responsibilities of the Pacific Grove Police Department should be? (Please check the most important three):

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Number (%) of votes:</u>
1. Crime prevention	1659 (81%)
2. Maintain peace and order	1274 (62)
3. Traffic control and enforcement	990 (48)
4. General vehicle patrol	784 (38)
5. Investigate other crimes	332 (16)
6. Protect our natural resources	307 (15)
7. Inform public of security hazards	300 (15)
8. Investigate fraud and identity theft.	263 (13)
9. Other	120 (6)
10. Investigate Internet and computer crimes.	49 (2)

Investigating fraud, identity theft, and Internet and computer crimes were ranked at the bottom of the list. Investigating "other crimes" was ranked number 5, and open-ended questions strongly suggest that this response is in part due to the public's desire to have unsolved murders solved. One indication is the rank of "investigating all crimes" in the list of "other" responsibilities desired for the police department (see below).

Protecting our natural resources (enforcing tide pool regulations, for example) was ranked number 6. The list of "other" responsibilities desired for our police department includes:

Focus on specific, identified problems (ex: rec trail, raccoons, drugs)	32 (29%)
Investigate/solve crimes	17 (16)
Prevention/education/public relations	16 (15)
Focus on youth problems	12 (11)
Youth prevention programs	9 (8)
Other misc. responsibilities	24 (22)

In a related question, Table 5b presents the respondents' views of where they would place a new, additional police officer, if one was added to the force. Again crime prevention topped the list, followed by general vehicle patrol, school resource officer, and bicycle patrol. If one combined bicycle and foot patrol, that role for a new officer would #1.

Coastal protection ranked number 8, and appeared to be a response indicating the desires of some to protect the tide pools and shoreline, and others to increase public safety along the waterfront. Community services was ranked last. 121 respondents checked the "other" response in regard to the possible role of a new officer. 25 of these (21%) were some version of "we don't need any more officers." The other most common responses are: traffic/parking enforcement (12%), wherever needed (11%), and a focus on specific problems (11%).

Table 6 presents the respondents' views of the police department's performance. Generally, the PG police received good marks, with the averages ranging from 3.5 to 4 out of a possible 5. The highest scores were given to how well the PG police "perform their duties," with 75% of the respondents giving the police a 4 or 5..

Table 5b: Priorities for the PG Police Department

If you could select the role of a new, additional police officer, what would it be? (Check one):

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Number (%) of votes:</u>
1. Crime prevention	322 (17%)
2. General vehicle patrol	309 (16)
3. School resource officer	259 (13)
4. Bicycle patrol	253 (12)
5. Motorcycle traffic enforcement	167 (9)
6. Foot patrol	162 (8)
7. Crime investigation	159 (8)
8. Coastal protection	136 (7)
9. Other	112 (6)
10. Community services	74 (4)

Table 6: Performance of the PG Police Department

<i>How well do you think Pacific Grove police officers perform their duties?</i>		Very poorly					Very well				
		1	2	3	4	5					
Average: 4.05		36	92	388	724	7					
		(2)	(5)	(19)	(36)	(39)					
<i>To what extent do you think the PG Police Department needs improvement?</i>		Great extent					Not at all				
		1	2	3	4	5					
Average: 3.48		71	208	608	781	249					
		(4)	(11)	(32)	(41)	(13)					
<i>Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:</i>		Strongly disagree			Strongly agree						
Average		1	2	3	4	5					
3.77	Pacific Grove police officers are fair in dealing with people.	84	164	456	634	599					
		(4)	(9)	(24)	(33)	(31)					
4.00	Pacific Grove police officers are professional and helpful.	61	125	355	642	780					
		(3)	(6)	(18)	(33)	(40)					
3.85	Pacific Grove police officers have good relations with the community.	77	157	420	614	675					
		(4)	(8)	(22)	(32)	(35)					
3.52	Pacific Grove police officers have good relations with minority groups.	97	160	517	410	373					
		(6)	(10)	(33)	(26)	(24)					
3.05	More police officers are needed in PG.	265	311	624	317	311					
		(15)	(17)	(34)	(17)	(17)					

Over 50% felt the police department needed no or little improvement, a third were in the middle on that issue, and 15% felt they needed improvement. A not uncommon response regardless of the actual rating was “there’s always room for improvement.”

On the more specific statements, most of the respondents agreed that the police officers are “professional and helpful” (average rating of 4.00), have good community relations (3.85), and are “fair in dealing with people” (3.77). The police department received its lowest rating (but still well above the midpoint) for its relations with minority groups (3.52). This question also elicited far more missing data than most questions (26%), and was often accompanied with comments to the effect that the respondents couldn’t judge this due to their perceptions that there is a small minority population in PG.

Respondents were asked whether more police officers are needed in Pacific Grove (the last question in Table 6). As many agreed with this statement as disagreed, with a sizable proportion (34%) right in the middle. (Note that in response the earlier question on the desired role a new officer, 21% of the 121 responding to this question said, in effect, that PG did not need any new officers.)

Respondents were asked about their contact with the PG police in different circumstances and their satisfaction with the police response in those circumstances (Table 7). There were four kinds of “contact:”

- Speaking to officers about crime(s) or problems in the neighborhood.
- Calling the police for assistance.
- Being a victim of a crime and reporting it to the police.
- Being arrested or cited by the police.

Type of contact	Percent and number reporting contact	Average satisfaction rating (1-5)	Number and (%)				
			Very dissatisfied			Very satisfied	
			1	2	3	4	5
Speaking to officers about crime(s) or problems in the neighborhood.	39% (799)	3.67	87 (11)	82 (10)	143 (18)	190 (24)	304 (38)
Calling the police for assistance.	32% (644)	3.82	62 (10)	61 (10)	98 (15)	135 (21)	290 (45)
Being a victim of crime and reporting it to the police.	11% (218) 80% (168)	3.27	37 (20)	20 (11)	34 (19)	38 (21)	53 (29)
Being arrested or cited by the police.	4% (80)	2.87	29 (35)	9 (11)	10 (12)	12 (15)	22 (27)

Nearly 40% of the respondents had spoken to a police officer in the past year about crime or problems in their neighborhood. The majority of these were satisfied with the police response, with 62% rating them a 4 or 5 out of 5. 21%, however, rated them at the other end of the scale.

About a third of the respondents had called the PG police for assistance during the past year, and rated their response fairly highly. 66% gave them a 4 or 5, while 20% were "very dissatisfied" or next to it.

Eleven percent of the respondents reported they were a victim of a crime in Pacific Grove during the past year. A very high rate, 80%, reported the crime to the police. 50% rated the police response highly (a 4 or 5), while 31% rated the response negatively.

Four percent of the respondents had been arrested or cited by the PG police during the past year. 42% gave high ratings, a 4 or 5, to the police handling of the situation, while 46% gave them low ratings, a 1 or 2 (the average was 2.87 out of 5).

Finally, the vast majority of the respondents – 95% – said they would be comfortable approaching a Pacific Grove police officer. 432 respondents added information to their answer to this question, and 53% made positive comments, 20% made negative ones, 9% were mixed, and 15% were neutral.

Differences in ratings of police performance by respondents of different ages, genders, and races were analyzed. For most measures of performance, perceptions of the PG police are positively correlated with age (and statistically significant). Those over 60 report the highest ratings of police performance (4.26 on average), while those under 18 report the lowest (3.58). People between 20 and 60 years of age have scores in between (3.73 to 4.05). This pattern holds true for all of the police-performance and satisfaction with police contact items. Only a handful of juveniles had been a crime victim or been arrested or cited by police; every one rated their satisfaction very low, a 1 out of 5. Those in their 20s gave average ratings of 2.90 and 2.50, while those over 60 gave average ratings of 3.70 and 3.00.

Men and women rated three measures of police performance differently: men rated the police higher on their relations with minorities, women were more apt to vote more strongly for more police officers, and women rated their satisfaction with speaking to the police about a crime or problem higher than men did. There were no significant gender differences on other police issues.

The non-minority white population gave the police a higher rating on "how well the PG police perform their duties," (average = 4.13) than did the minority population (average = 3.98). No other performance measures had significantly different ratings among the two groups.

Significant differences between residents and business owners were that residents were apt to agree with the statement that more police officers are needed, and business owners gave the police higher ratings in their response to reporting a crime (3.85 vs. 3.27).

Summary

Respondents. The response to the survey was excellent, with a quarter of the city's residents and businesses, a sizable and stable sample, responding in some detail. The respondents represent

the views of adult members of the community; as a group they are a little older than the population as a whole, and reflect the views of more women and fewer people of color than the city's population at large. But these differences are slight. While the survey methods cannot guarantee that the respondents are truly representative of the city's population, it appears that a good cross-section of the city's adult population responded to share their views on community problems, safety, and the PG police department.

Perceptions of problems and personal safety. Residents confirm that PG is not perceived as having serious crime problems and fear of crime is low.. Traffic issues are the number one concern, followed by juvenile problems, concerns about destruction of our natural resources, and vandalism. None of these problems, however, are rated terribly high – on a scale of 1 to 5, only the top three problems received ratings over 2.5, and not too far over.

Noise and disturbance problems revolve around traffic and neighborhood noise – loud motorcycles and cars, parties and neighbors' music, barking dogs, "boom cars," leaf blowers and the like, and construction noise. Low on the list of problems are the serious issues of elder abuse, gangs, child abuse, and vice.

All in all, PG residents feel very safe anywhere in the city during the day. This is terrific news. Over half, however, feel unsafe in specific areas at night, notably the rec trail and beach areas. The rec trail, where several serious violent crimes have occurred in the past several years, was – not surprisingly – the number one unsafe place. Our beaches and waterfront came in second, followed by parks – all places which are dark and sparsely populated. Yet even the parks, at #3 on the list of unsafe places after dark, was mentioned by only 7% of the respondents, an indication that it is mostly the rec trail that people perceive as unsafe. Remarkably, the downtown area, a serious public safety problem in many cities, was cited as feeling unsafe by just 10 of the 2112 respondents.

The finding that juveniles perceptions of safety are slightly lower than those of many adults is surprising, but appropriate. In most crime surveys, the young (especially males) report little fear of crime yet are the most victimized, while the elderly, the least victimized, report the highest fear of crime.

Views of the police department. Resident views of the proper responsibilities of the police department are fairly traditional, with the top priorities seen as crime prevention, maintaining peace and order, and traffic enforcement. There was also considerable sentiment for crime investigation, with a number of respondents hoping the unsolved murders will be solved, and for the protection of natural resources.

Crime prevention also topped the list of roles for a new police officer, although increasing citizen-police contact through foot and bicycle patrol was also ranked highly. This was also evident in the open-ended responses – citizens would like to see and know more of their officers, and have friendlier interactions with them. Attention to white collar crimes – fraud, identity theft, Internet crime, etc. – was not highly rated.

Residents' views about the PG police department are pretty high, all in all. The majority of people feel the officers are fair, professional, and have good relations with the community. A small but sizable percentage (9-16%), however, is quite dissatisfied with local police performance. From comments, it is apparent that *one small negative interaction with an officer is remembered for a long, long time*. Perceived rudeness and arrogance probably top the list of complaints – countered by more than twice as many comments about officers' friendliness and professionalism.

A large number of respondents, nearly 40%, had a community policing type contact with the PG police, and the majority were quite satisfied with the department's response. Again, however, about 20% were dissatisfied.

11% reported they were a victim of a crime in Pacific Grove during the past year, considerably lower than the national average. A very high number, 80%, reported the crime to the police, which may be to the nature of the crime, trust in the police, or other reasons. Again, over half were quite satisfied while 30% were dissatisfied. It is notable that just about as many people were satisfied with how the police handled their arrest or citation as were unhappy.

Over 1,000 respondents added comments, some of them several pages long and accompanied with diagrams and drawings of such things like re-designed intersections. They cover specific concerns, positive and negative comments about the department in general and individual officers in particular, stories of interactions with police (some of which occurred years ago), exactly what they think the police should do about their concerns, praise for Pacific Grove, and much more.

The results of this survey are good news for the city of Pacific Grove. The majority of residents and business owners in town perceive crime problems to be minor, feel safe almost everywhere except along on the rec trail and a few other places after dark, view their police department as fair and professional, and are satisfied with their personal experiences with police officers. They do not express a strong desire to increase the size of the police force, as they are satisfied with the safety and quality of their neighborhood. The results provide information to the police department regarding specific problems within the community and areas within the department to address.