

**TOWN OF GREENWICH, CT
POLICE DEPARTMENT**

RESIDENT SURVEY OF POLICING NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March of 2003, James A. Walters was appointed to the position of Chief of Police of the Greenwich Police Department. A primary goal of Chief James A. Walters was to utilize the resources of the Greenwich Police Department in an effort to create a closer relationship with the residents of the Town of Greenwich, as well as formulate a long-term strategic plan to be used as a guide to accomplish department goals. The goal of creating a closer relationship with residents would be accomplished by way of employing community policing strategies.

The backbone of community policing is the concept of working with the community to address causes of crime and quality of life issues in an effort to reduce the problems themselves and the associated fear through a wide range of activities. We believe the first step toward achieving this goal is to better understand the community's strengths and weaknesses, what residents want from their police department, and most importantly, what neighborhoods identify as priorities. The belief is that a resident survey of policing needs and priorities in Greenwich is needed to accomplish this goal.

This survey is just one step in the larger department goal to create a long-term strategic plan that would establish as a stronghold, concepts and strategies of community policing.

Brief synopsis of findings:

Six hundred (600) surveys were randomly mailed to town residents. Two Hundred and nineteen (219) completed surveys were returned. The results of this second survey mirror the results of the 2004 survey in that the number one quality of life issue impacting residents is traffic, followed closely by drugs within the town. Residents also overwhelmingly ranked traffic enforcement as the number one activity they would like police officers to perform in their neighborhood. The overall quality of life in Greenwich was rated as very good and the majority of respondents agree or strongly agree they feel safe living in Greenwich. Greenwich Police Officers received high scores in performance and demeanor categories, and were reported as being very visible to the public. The department received lower ratings in the areas of working with residents in regards to traffic enforcement and combating neighborhood crime.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPEMENT

Purpose:

In an effort to create a long-term strategic plan that would incorporate the adoption of community policing strategies, the Greenwich Police Department conducted this survey, which is the second resident survey ever conducted. The purpose of the survey is an effort to seek direct citizen opinion and input. It is understood that in order to create a working relationship with the residents of the Town, we must first try to understand what aspects of policing are important to residents, as well as establish a plan to evaluate new strategies being employed. Additional aspects of the survey measure citizen satisfaction with the quality of services provided and utilize the information gathered as a form of self-evaluation. Information such as citizen attitudes, levels of satisfaction and the volume of unreported crime couldn't be gathered in any other way. Lessons learned from the analysis of the data obtained will identify community needs and assist in tailoring the appropriate responses to meet those needs and concerns.

One aspect of this long-term plan is to continue to seek input on a regular basis to evaluate whether our programs and/or employees are meeting expectations and fulfilling the needs of our community. Ensuing surveys will be framed so that similar categories will generate results which can be compared over time.

Survey Development:

This survey was developed with input from numerous members of the Greenwich Police Department, resource materials from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and information obtained from other Law Enforcement Agencies. The survey was also reviewed by members of the International Association of Law Enforcement Planners who provided input and guidance.

The survey questionnaire is a nine-page document with a total of 95 questions. The survey has six (6) topic categories, listed below, with the number of questions in each category indicated.

- Respondent Characteristics – 5 questions
- Quality of Life – 11 questions
- Contact with Police/Performance Evaluation – 18 questions
- Neighborhood Issues and Concerns – 31 questions
- Concerns on Crime Categories – 17 questions
- Evaluation of Police Service Standards – 13 questions

Questions:

- There was one open-ended question in the quality of life category
- The respondent characteristics category contained generic personal data questions, to aide in categorizing responses.
- All other questions were of a multiple-choice type with responses assigned a varying point scale.
- For purposes of data tabulation each question in the survey was numbered, creating a master number list. The number sequence was not made a part of the survey distributed to residents. The number sequence used in the tables is not in succession and should not be used without the master number list.

Residents were advised in a cover letter that participation in the survey was voluntary and the responses would be kept confidential. The information obtained is for research purposes and will be used to develop and refine the department's strategic plan for delivery of services to the community.

Survey Administration:

Two surveys using the same questionnaire were initiated. The sample groups targeted in both surveys were Town of Greenwich residents. For the purposes of quality control the surveys were administered independently. The first survey was conducted by way of random mailing with households targeted. The second survey, which is still ongoing, is being conducted by way of direct contact with citizens through attendance at community meetings. The results of the surveys are not commingled in this report, which contains only the results of the random mailed survey.

Administration of random survey:

The below listed statistics were obtained from:

U.S. Census Bureau report, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2004;
Geographic Area: Greenwich Town, Fairfield County, Connecticut:

- Total Population..... 62,240
- Total Households..... 24,795

A goal of the survey is to obtain data that would assist in the deployment of policing strategies that targeted certain areas (neighborhoods) of the Town of Greenwich. Understanding the diversity of the Town of Greenwich, the survey was administered in a manner that would obtain data on both a town wide basis as well as break the town down into smaller sample groups referred to as neighborhoods in the survey. The term “neighborhoods” as used in the survey refers to residential areas delineated by zip code. There are five zip code areas in the Town of Greenwich which, in an abbreviated manner, can be described as follows: (See *Hagstrom* street map – Greenwich, CT, for detailed zip code boundaries.)

	Zip Code:	Residential areas within zip codes:
#1	06830	Byram Belle Haven Central Greenwich
#2	06831	Pemberwick Rock Ridge Glenville Riversville Quaker Ridge North Greenwich Banksville
#3	06878	Riverside
#4	06870	Old Greenwich
#5	06807	Cos Cob North Mianus

A total of six hundred (600) surveys were mailed; one hundred twenty (120) to each “neighborhood.” A computer program randomly selected households from a current Greenwich Voter Registration list and created the mailing list to these five “neighborhoods.”

Analysis and Interpretation of Survey Results:

Survey Return:

- A total of 219 completed surveys were returned.
- The survey return per “neighborhood” was:

Zip Code:	Survey Return
06830	47
06831	45
06878	39
06870	42
06807	46

Data Interpretation:

A number of questions were designed to obtain a yes or no response and/or a direct response in some fashion. These questions, which are easily discernible by reviewing the tables, were computed by adding the total response to each answer choice for that question. For example in a question with a “yes” or “no” response, the sum of “yes” responses is listed in one column with the sum of “no” responses listed respectively.

Other questions were designed with point values assigned to each response with varying scales used for particular questions. The point scales are listed in the tables with each affected question listed respectively. For example, in a question with a 5 point scale, a value of 5 points would be assigned a response of “strongly agree” and a value of one point “strongly disagree” and weighted averages were computed. An average score of 5 would mean that everyone “strongly agreed” with the statement; an average score of 1 would indicate everyone “strongly disagreed” with the statement. An average score of 3 would indicate rather neutral responses. In other questions, the point scale was used to indicate a range of responses from “excellent” to “very poor,” from “very safe” to “no opinion,” and so on. The same logic applies, however.

For questions with point values, the extremes of individual responses are “averaged out”. A score of 3 can be derived in any number of ways: everyone could select “3” or for everyone selecting a “4” an equal number selected a “2,” or any other combination of selections yielding the same weighted average. The dispersion is measured in terms of “standard deviation,” a statistical term that calculates the deviation from the mean answer. A high standard of deviation means there was a wide variation in the responses to a particular question; a low standard deviation means that more respondents tended to select the same (or nearly same) response. The standard deviation scores are shown in the tables.

Calculations of percentage figures used in this survey were rounded off.

Changes from the 2004 Survey:

After tabulating and reviewing the first survey in 2004 it was determined that some changes and deletions needed to be made, and certain questions required tailoring in hopes of getting a more accurate response to the question. Below is a list of changes from the 2004 survey:

- Under the **Quality of Life** category, the question was asked: Please rate the quality of life in Greenwich? The response of “FAIR” was removed.
- Under the **Contact with the Police** category, the questioning in the 2004 survey was worded: If you called the Greenwich Police Department, please give your response to the initial person taking your call. The response of “FAIR” was removed leaving only the response of excellent, very good, good, poor and very poor in the 2005 survey.
- In the 2004 survey under the **Contact with the Police** category, the question was worded: In the past 6 months have you had the need to contact the Greenwich Police Department? Upon tabulating the 2004 survey, only 25% of the respondents had some kind of contact with the police in that 6-month period. In the 2005 it was decided that a longer time frame was needed to generate a more accurate and valid response to this question. The question was changed to, Have you had the need to contact the Greenwich Police Department, Yes or No? If YES, indicate the most suitable time frame of last contact, 6months, 6months-1year, 1year-2years, more than 2 years? In the 2005 survey this change generated a 71% response rate compared to the 25% response in 2004.
- Finally under the **Contact with Police** category, certain questions were changed by adding a 2 year time frame in which the responders had **contact with the police, called the police**, and if the respondents had **contact with an officer** instead of the 1 year time frame.
- Under the category of **Neighborhood Issue/Concerns**, the wording was changed in the response column from Better, Same, Worse, Not Sure, to Very Big Problem, Big Problem, Minor Problem, Not a Problem. Also any question requiring a “No Opinion” response was removed in hopes of providing a better response to the question. The respondent had to at least give some kind of an opinion.
- Lastly under the category of **Neighborhood Issue/Concerns**, the following question was changed to reflect the following: In the past six months, have you observed a difference in police presence in your neighborhood? The response to this question was: Increase, Decrease, No Change, Don’t Know, and changed to Better, Same, Worse.

THE RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics:

Question	Zip Code 06830	Zip Code 06831	Zip Code 06878	Zip Code 06870	Zip Code 06807	Total Sample Group	% of Group Representation
Zip Code: (total number of surveys received)	47	45	39	42	46	219	
Age Range:							
18 - 29	2	2	0	1	2	7	3%
30 - 39	3	4	7	5	7	26	12%
40 - 49	15	11	8	11	14	59	28%
50 - 59	7	12	7	12	9	47	22%
60 and over	19	16	14	12	14	75	35%
						(total respondents to this question):	155
Sex:							
Female	17	16	12	22	20	87	41%
Male	29	29	23	18	25	125	59%
						(total respondents to this question):	153
Do You:							
Own	41	39	37	36	40	193	91%
Rent	5	5	0	4	5	19	9%
						(total respondents to this question):	155
Length of time living in Town: (years)	22.78	27.65	25.10	23.34	24.70	24.71	

Respondent's Characteristic Conclusions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the "total sample group" data. It should be noted not all respondents completed this section of the survey and if it was not completed, it was not used. A total of 8 surveys were returned incomplete and not used.

- Approximately 37% of the total numbers of surveys mailed were returned. This is a dramatic increase from the 2004 survey in which only 26% were returned.
- The 60 and over age group represented the highest returned response in the sample; the group represents approximately 34% of the total number of respondents. This statistic is typical in a mail survey.
- The 40 – 49 and 50 – 59 age groups were evenly represented, representing approximately 28% and 22% respectively.
- The 18 – 29 and 30 – 39 age groups were both severely under-represented, under 3% and 12% respectively
- Female respondents represented approximately 41%, and male respondents represented 59% of the sample group, which was nearly the same as in the 2004 survey-42% female to 58% male response.
- Property owners were clearly over-represented compared to those who rent, 91% to 9% respectively.

Quality of Life Conclusions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that can be drawn from the “total sample group” data.

- Respondents rated the “**Quality of Life**” in Greenwich as between, “**Excellent**” and “**Very Good.**” The response was consistent in each “neighborhood.”
- Respondents indicated they “**STRONGLY AGREE**” to “**AGREE**” they “**feel safe living in Greenwich**” as well as “**feel safe walking around their neighborhood**”; again the response was fairly consistent in each “neighborhood.”
- The majority of respondents “**DISAGREE**” **drug dealing/use is a problem in their neighborhood.**
- Responses to “**the Greenwich Police Department understands my neighborhood concerns,**” as well as “**treat all persons equally and fair,**” fall between “**NEUTRAL**” to “**AGREE.**”
- All of respondents did “**AGREE**” they **have confidence in and overall are satisfied with the Greenwich Police Department.**

Contact with Police/Performance Conclusions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the “total sample group” data.

- 71% of respondents have had **contact** with the police within the past 2 years as compared to 25% of the respondents in a 6-month time frame in the 2004 survey.
- It should be noted of the 71% of respondents who answered the question inquiring, “During my last contact with the Greenwich Police Department, I was?” Only 4% were “victims” of a crime, and 59% responded “other” type of contact.
- 29% of the 219 respondents indicated they did have contact with the police in the past-year. The largest group represented were those who sought information by telephone (21%); followed by those seeking assistance from the Animal Control Division (16%), which is identical to the 2004 survey.
- Respondents rated the performance of “**Call-Takers**” as “**VERY GOOD**” except in the 06878 area code, (Riverside) where they rated the call takers slightly below very good. The survey did not identify call-takers as police officers.
- The average rating response to “**Officer Performance**” was above “**VERY GOOD**” which is an improvement from the 2004 survey.
- All of the categories under **Officer Demeanor** were rated slightly over “**VERY GOOD**”
- The high rating of **Officer Performance** was fairly consistent throughout each “neighborhood.” Only the 06878 area code, (Riverside) had a lower rating in the **officer’s helpfulness** and the **officer’s interest** in the situation category, which they rated as slightly below “**VERY GOOD**”.

Neighborhood Issues/Concerns Conclusions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the “total sample group” data.

- Respondents were asked to rate the following problems in Greenwich over the past year: **Speeding Vehicles, Traffic Congestion, Noise, Underage Drinking and Juvenile Problems.** “**Speeding Vehicles**” was rated as the **#1 issue of concern**, followed by “**Traffic Congestion**”. Each categorized as bordering on being a “**VERY BIG PROBLEM**”. These were the top two issues in the 2004 survey as well. Regarding the above, it should be noted the issue of “**Juvenile problems**” received the lowest score in this category and was rated as a “**MINOR PROBLEM**”.
- Under the **Opinion Of Police Performance** category, the respondents rated the department slightly “**Above Average**” in all of the categories: **Police Visibility, Traffic Enforcement, Drug Laws, Preventing Juvenile Crime, and Responding to Problems in the Schools.**
- Regarding the above category: **Police response to problems in the schools** was ranked as the #1 problem in this category, which is the complete opposite of the 2004 survey.
- Respondents indicated, “**Speeding Motor Vehicles**” was once again considered the **#1 issue of concern** in each “**neighborhood**”; categorized as bordering on being a “**BIG PROBLEM.**”
- It should be noted that in all of the “neighborhoods” “**garbage on the streets**” and “**loud parties**” were considered a “**MINOR PROBLEM.**”
- The average response on **how police serve neighborhoods** was slightly over “**SATISFIED**”.
- The majority of the respondents have **not noticed any difference in Police Presence in their neighborhood** in the past 6 months, and the respondents were “**Satisfied**” with the police who do serve their neighborhood.
- 96% of the respondents indicated they heard about community meetings taking place in their neighborhood
- Of the 96% of the respondents who indicated they heard about community meetings only 15% attended any of the meetings.
- By far the #1 reason given for not attending meetings was “**Don’t know location and/or date and time**”. This was the #1 reason in the 2004 survey as well.
- When asked, “**How much work are police doing with residents of your neighborhood to prevent crime and safety problems?**” the average response was just above the rating value for “**VERY LITTLE.**” This is a slight improvement from the 2004 survey.

Crime Categories Conclusions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the “total sample group” data.

- Respondents ranked their concerns on the following crime categories:
 1. Drugs
 2. Traffic issues
 3. Burglary-residential
 4. Violent crimes
 5. Underage drinking
 6. Domestic Violence
 7. Vandalism
 8. White-collar crimes (fraud, ID theft, credit card theft)
 9. Hate crimes
 10. Gangs
 11. Disturbing the peace
 12. Juvenile crimes (loitering and disorderly conduct)
 13. Homelessness
 14. Auto Theft
 15. Burglary-commercial

- **Drugs** and **Traffic issues** were ranked as the top two issues of concern in the 2004 survey as well.
- The fact that **Drugs** was ranked so high is surprising given the low number of actual drug related calls received by this department. The fact that “**Drugs**” is ranked so high may indicate that a large number of residents in Greenwich are fearful it will become a problem.
- Another unusual statistic is the high ranking “**Violent crimes**” received, considering the low number of such crimes occurring in this community and the low rating “**Auto theft**” received considering the number of auto thefts that occur in this town every year.
- **95%** of the respondents to the question, “**Do you feel the Town of Greenwich Police Department is visible to the public?**” responded, “**YES.**”

Conclusions to the Open Ended Questions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the “total sample group” data.

- Of the 159 respondents who answered the question: **What would you consider to be the SINGLE most important issue facing Greenwich today?** 78 of those respondents listed some kind of **TRAFFIC ISSUE** as their most important concern; be it speeding vehicles, traffic congestion, or parking complaints. This was the #1 response to this question in the 2004 survey as well.

Service Standards Conclusions: The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the “total sample group” data.

- Respondents ranked the importance of service standards as follows:
 1. Response times
 2. Crime rates
 3. Citizen satisfaction with police services
 4. Enforcement of traffic laws
 5. Crime clearance rates
 6. Time dedicated to community policing
 7. Active involvement in schools

- Response time and crime clearance rates were the two most important service standards in the 2004 survey as well.
- The average response indicated respondents were “SOMEWHAT” to “NOT AT ALL” familiar with the term “**School Resource Officer (SRO)**” but after being given a definition of the role of a “SRO,” the majority of respondents indicated they would be in favor of implementation of a “SRO” program in the Greenwich School System.
- Prior to being given a definition of the term “**Community Policing,**” the average value scores indicated respondents, were “SOMEWHAT” familiar with the term. After being provided with a definition, a higher number of respondents indicated they would be in favor of police practicing community-policing concepts in their neighborhoods.
- When asked, “**What types of things do you wish the police were doing in your neighborhood?**” respondents ranked the given choices as follows (percentage of respondent choices are listed respectively):
 1. Traffic enforcement (42%)
 2. Assigning the same officers to my neighborhood each day (34%)
 3. Increasing the number of officers patrolling the streets (30%)
 4. Working with community to prevent crime (29%)
 5. They are doing what I want them to do (27%)
 6. Working with children in the area to give them a safe place to play (21%)
 7. Doing home security checks/surveys (20%)
 8. Towing abandoned cars (9%)
 9. Other (8%)

Responses to Open Ended Question:

Question: What would you consider to be the **SINGLE** most important issue facing Greenwich today?

Survey #	Response:
1	Traffic
2	
3	Community Policing & Traffic
4	Traffic
5	Need more places for teens to be safe. More activities for teens
6	
7	Foot traffic on residential streets
8	Traffic
9	
10	Parking in Downtown Greenwich
11	Drugs (illegal) are everywhere. Also, kids have no problem getting alcohol.
12	Traffic on I95 with attendant air pollution
13	Urban Spiral-Too much construction
14	
15	Speeders, in big cars, more traffic lights for cars entering and leaving a main road.
16	Drugs
17	I am confident in GPD However the Department needs more P/O's. I reside in back country where few if any officers patrol the area in the mornings when people speed on North Street.
18	Communication with public. Parking-Congestion on Greenwich Avenue.
19	Drugs among High school & Jr. High
20	
21	Traffic
22	Parking Downtown
23	Traffic
24	
25	Crime against personal property, burglary, theft
26	Drugs in GHS
27	
28	Teen drugs and alcohol use. Traffic.
29	Traffic congestion & parking
30	
31	Traffic
32	
33	Repairing the roads
34	Robberies are easier due to residents feeling of security
35	
36	Traffic
37	
38	Overbuilding
39	Traffic & Parking
40	
41	Traffic - Amount of and attitude of drivers
42	McMansions & Traffic
43	
44	
45	Schools for the increasing number of kids
46	Teens

47	Can't be that specific, but adult DUI is horrendous
48	Traffic
49	Traffic congestion
50	How are you going to protect the Police Department's families in the event of another disaster so that they don't feel compelled to abandon their posts and take care of their families living out of town. What safe quarter plans have you placed into effect? Without a plan, don't count on your people staying.
51	Underage Drinking Drugs
52	Traffic & Parking
53	Missing Survey
54	
55	Vehicular Misbehavior Security & Safety
56	
57	Excess speed on all streets
58	Speeding on Post Road and residential streets
59	Too fast driving (especially exiting Greenwich Point Driftway and onto Shore Road in Old Greenwich)
60	Over development, loss of green space, building of oversize houses for property. This may lead to very heavy traffic.
61	Traffic
62	
63	
64	Speeding Traffic & Bad Drivers
65	
66	Taxes
67	Speeding
68	
69	Inconsiderate Drivers
70	Traffic/Overcrowding
71	Traffic/Overcrowding
72	Very heavy auto & truck traffic on main roads. Too many autos.
73	
74	Traffic
75	Drugs in School. Traffic
76	
77	
78	Traffic problems
79	
80	Traffic - run off of 95 onto our roads. Major traffic tie-ups on Friday night and holidays.
81	In the area of Public Safety, lack of enforcement of traffic laws and regulations.
82	Public education
83	
84	Speeding. Traffic. Disregard for other drivers.
85	Need for a professional City/Town Manager
86	
87	
88	Safety-in our neighborhood, especially regarding traffic violations.
89	Traffic congestion
90	Parking for shopping
91	
92	
93	Road/Traffic Safety
94	

95	Small number of police
96	
97	
98	Traffic Control
99	Traffic in Byram due to Costco
100	Traffic
101	Quality of life issue enforcement
102	
103	
104	Use of drugs; drinking while driving
105	Speeding. Traffic. Young kids hanging on Greenwich Avenue in the evenings in packs. Parking-it's getting overcrowded.
106	Traffic
107	Parking
108	Traffic/Noise/Theft (auto)
109	
110	
111	Other than terrorist attacks, speed of drivers in highly populated neighborhoods.
112	Commercially-probably parking. In terms both educationally and op safety a smaller rather than larger high school would be better but unlikely to occur.
113	
114	Cars going too fast
115	
116	
117	Crime Prevention, Traffic congestion
118	Teenage drinking. Drug availability.
119	Overly indulged kids with too much freedom, not enough parental interacting-especially at GHS
120	
121	
122	Teenage Drinking.
123	
124	Over development
125	People driving recklessly while talking on cell phones, especially in parking lots
126	We should develop neighborhood organization throughout the town to be prepared for any terrorist activities. Each street in all communities should be involved similar to the neighborhood patrols during WWII
127	Traffic
128	
129	
130	Traffic
131	Traffic sounds silly but living in Central Greenwich with two children in elementary school. I'm continuously shocked by the lack of awareness or respect drivers have for pedestrians. I love the policemen on the Avenue, they help keep things sane.
132	Traffic
133	Town employees (Police, teachers) not being able to afford Greenwich residence
134	
135	Inequitable distribution of property taxes between residential and commercial properties
136	Traffic
137	Overbuilding/Traffic (not strictly police related issues, I know)
138	Police are too aggressive with traffic violations
139	Town expenditures too high because of lack of planning long-range
140	Parking

141	Stay as we are
142	Traffic
143	Traffic
144	Traffic, car accidents
145	
146	Traffic, speeding, discourtesy of drivers, congestion on I-95 (not a local police problem I know) unsafe conditions for pedestrians
147	Traffic/speeding congestion
148	Too much traffic, too fast drivers
149	Underage drinking, drugs. Kids hanging out on the Avenue at night are asking for trouble.
150	Drunk driving, Illegal Drugs
151	Traffic
152	Parking
153	
154	Maintaining good schools
155	Speeding. I have three small children and live on a small road. There is no reason to speed. Also too many people talking on cell phones when driving fast down streets where children play. People have big cars, speed, talk on phones and don't pay attention.
156	
157	

Overall Survey Conclusions:

The following is a summary of a number of conclusions and observations that were drawn from the “total sample group” data from the entire survey.

- According to the respondents, Greenwich is a safe place to live and the quality of life is rated as very good. The residents feel secure walking around their neighborhoods and drugs are not considered to be a problem in any of their neighborhoods, even though respondent’s ranked drugs as a number one concern in town.
- The respondents have confidence in and are generally satisfied with the overall performance of the Greenwich Police Department.
- The majority of those who had contact with the police did so over the phone requesting information. Dispatchers/Desk Officers can dictate how the public perceives the Department. Police officers received high ratings in performance and demeanor.
- It should be noted that residents feel police visibility and police presence in their neighborhoods was not adequate and residents border on being dissatisfied. In contrast 95% of the respondents feel the Police Department is visible to the general public. It is apparent by analyzing this data that the police officers are visible to the public but there is inadequate visibility or contact within the individual neighborhoods.
- Respondents ranked juvenile problems as a minor problem over the past year. This is surprising considering all the media and public attention this topic has received in 2005.
- The residents of Greenwich, according to the survey, are more concerned about drugs, traffic issues and residential burglaries, (these crimes were ranked as the top three in the 2004 survey as well) than they are with auto theft, juvenile crimes and commercial burglaries, which are also prevalent within the town. It should be noted that these crimes ranked very low in the 2004 survey also.
- An officer’s response time according to the respondents was the best indicator in evaluating the police department’s performance.
- Lack of traffic enforcement and traffic issues was once again the biggest complaint in all of the respective neighborhoods and something the residents wished the police department was doing more of in their neighborhoods
- The respondents were receptive to a SRO in the Greenwich school system and were also in favor of the Greenwich Police Department practicing Community Policing in their neighborhood.

Appendixes:

Survey Questionnaire that lists question numbers.

Submitted by: Lt. Richard Cochran