



Community Indicators Project at UAA

**Anchorage Community Survey 2009:
Anchorage Police-Related Results**

Prepared for the
Anchorage Police Department

by

Sharon Chamard, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

JC 0508.031

October 12, 2011

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

All rights reserved. Published by the Justice Center in 2011 (JC 0508.03)

© 2011 Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage

Printed in the United States of America

Community Indicators Project at UAA

**Anchorage Community Survey 2009:
Anchorage Police-Related Results**

Prepared for the
Anchorage Police Department

by

Sharon Chamard, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

JC 0508.031

October 12, 2011

Page blank by intention.

Contents

Survey Background.....	1
Survey Questions	1
Satisfaction with APD Services	1
Contact with APD	2
Recent Experience with APD.....	2
Caution Regarding Data Comparison	3
Tables	3
Table 3.07. Satisfaction with Police Services	4
Table 4.01. Fairness of Anchorage Police	6
Table 5.01. Anchorage Police — Response to Calls for Assistance	8
Table 5.02. Anchorage Police — Not Using Excessive Force	10
Table 5.03. Anchorage Police — Being Helpful and Friendly	12
Table 5.04. Anchorage Police — Treating People Fairly	14
Table 5.05. Anchorage Police — Investigating and Solving Crime	16
Table 5.06. Anchorage Police — Preventing Crime	18
Table 5.07. Anchorage Police — Dealing with Neighborhood Problems.....	20
Table 5.08. Anchorage Police — Maintaining Order in Neighborhood	22
Table 5.09. Contact in Past Year with Police to Request Information	24
Table 5.10. Contact in Past Year with Police to Report a Situation Requiring Police Intervention.....	26
Table 5.11. Contact in Past Year with Police to Report Being Victimized by Crime	28
Table 5.12. Contact in Past Year with Police to Follow Up on Prior Report	30
Table 5.13. Contact in Past Year with Police to Provide Witness Information	32
Table 5.14. Contact in Past Year with Police on Traffic Violation.....	34
Table 5.15. Contact in Past Year with Police While Being Detained Regarding a Crime	36
Table 5.16. Contact in Past Year with Police While Being Arrested for a Crime	38
Table 5.17. Contact in Past Year with Police While Socializing.....	40
Table 5.19. Most Recent Experience with Anchorage Police Officer.....	42
Table 5.20. Confidence in Anchorage Police Department	44
Table 5.21. Accessibility of Anchorage Police Department Services	46
Table 5.22. Contact by Family or Friend with Anchorage Police Officer in Past Twelve Months	48

Page blank by intention.

Anchorage Community Survey 2009: Anchorage Police-Related Results

Survey Background

The 2009 Anchorage Community Survey (ACS) was conducted during the summer and fall of 2009. The survey used a mixed-mode design, which allowed people to respond either by mail or over the Internet. From a list of adult heads-of-household living in the Anchorage municipality, 4,702 people were selected for inclusion in the study. Administration of the survey had five stages, beginning with a pre-notification letter, followed by the survey itself, then two mailings of reminder postcards, and finally, another copy of the survey. Of the 4,702 subjects included in the sample, 560 were removed because their surveys were undeliverable for a variety of reasons. In total, 2,106 completed questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 50.8 percent. Of those, 2,080 contained sufficient responses for inclusion in the dataset.

Survey Questions

The ACS asked respondents about the quality of life in their Anchorage neighborhood, their satisfaction with municipal services, and their opinion of the criminal justice system, including the police. This report presents the findings of the 23 questions that focused on the Anchorage Police Department (APD). These questions concerned satisfaction with police services and opinions on matters such as whether the police are fair, and whether they are effective in preventing crime and maintaining order. Several questions asked about the nature of contact respondents had with someone from APD in the previous year.

Satisfaction with APD Services

Overall, respondents were satisfied with APD, with close to two-thirds (66%) of those who answered this question reporting they were either *satisfied* (43%) or *very satisfied* (23%). On a five-point scale, where *very dissatisfied* was counted as 1, and *very satisfied* as 5, this calculated to an average rating of 3.69, that is, between *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied* (worth 3) and *satisfied* (worth 4). The rating on a comparable question asked in the 2007 ACS was 3.72; this is not a significant or meaningful change.

Across community councils, the average rating on satisfaction with police services ranged from 3.00 to 4.00. It should be noted that there several community councils with a small number of respondents. The averages from these areas may vary considerably due to the responses of a low number of people. Community council-level percentages and ratings should thus be interpreted with caution, particularly for those community council areas with few respondents.

On a four-point scale, where *poor* = 1 and *excellent* = 4, survey participants on average rated APD between *fair* (worth 2) and *good* (worth 3) on a variety of measures of the level and quality of police service provided to Anchorage residents. The highest-rated measures relate to perceptions of APD interaction with citizens: “NOT using excessive force” (2.97), “being helpful and friendly” (2.94), and “treating people fairly” (2.85). Respondents rated APD highly as well on measures concerning the “traditional” police functions of law enforcement and order maintenance: “maintaining order on the streets and sidewalks in your neighborhood” (2.80), “investigating/solving crime” (2.73), and “responding quickly to calls for help and assistance” (2.72). Measures of the level and quality of proactive police activity were rated lowest: “dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood” (2.60) and “preventing crime” (2.46). It is important to note that there were large numbers of survey participants who replied they didn’t know the answer to these questions concerning the level and quality of APD services. *Don’t know* responses ranged between 35% (for both “dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood” and “NOT using excessive force”) to 15% (for “being helpful and friendly”).

Contact with APD

Of the 2,080 respondents in the sample, 874, or 42 percent, reported no contact with APD in the previous twelve months. The most commonly-reported reasons for official contact with APD were to report a situation requiring police intervention (29%) or to request information (23%). Almost one-quarter of respondents (23%) said they had socialized with an APD officer in his or her civilian life. Sixteen percent reported they had been stopped for a traffic violation, while only one percent of respondents indicated they had either been detained regarding a crime or been arrested for a crime. One in ten of the survey participants had contact with APD because they were reporting being a victim of crime; this was about the same percentage as those who said they had followed up on a previously filed report (11%) or had provided witness information about a crime being investigated (10%).

Recent Experience with APD

Respondents were asked to think about their most recent experience with an APD officer and judge whether the officer’s behavior was competent and appropriate. Eighty-nine percent of those who answered said yes, but it is worth noting that 21 percent responded they didn’t know the answer to the question. The majority of respondents had either *quite a lot* (40%) or *a great deal* (17%) of confidence in APD. Only fifteen percent rated their confidence as *none* or *very little*. A question was asked about the availability of APD services, and almost 80 percent of people thought these services are either somewhat or very accessible. Low ratings on this variable appear to be

largely related to geographic location; respondents in the less urban parts of city, such as Basher, Turnagain Arm, Bear Valley, and Eagle River, as well as the Elmendorf and Fort Richardson military bases, on average gave APD lower scores on accessibility of services.

Caution Regarding Data Comparison

Comparing these results to those from the 2007 ACS is not advised because the wording of these questions changed somewhat and the scale used to calculate the ratings was different. Specifically, the 2007 ACS used a five-point scale, while the 2009 ACS used a four-point scale.

Tables

Tables showing detail of the responses to questions regarding satisfaction with APD services are attached.

Table 3.07a. Satisfaction with Police Services: Summary

Question 13c. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way that each of the following services is provided in Anchorage? — **Police services**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Very dissatisfied	48	2.3 %	1.0	2.6 %
Dissatisfied	259	12.6	2.0	14.1
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	326	15.8	3.0	17.7
Satisfied	787	38.2	4.0	42.7
Very satisfied	421	20.4	5.0	22.9
Don't know	219	10.6		
Total valid	2,060	100.0 %		
Missing	20			
Total	2,080			




Table 3.07b. Satisfaction with Police Services: Detail

Question 13c. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way that each of the following services is provided in Anchorage? — **Police services**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹					
			Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,060 ²	3.69	2.3 %	12.6 %	15.8 %	38.2 %	20.4 %	10.6 %
Community Council area³								
Abbott Loop	191	3.60	1.6 %	17.8 %	14.1 %	36.1 %	18.8 %	11.5 %
Airport Heights	43	3.87	0.0	9.3	18.6	37.2	25.6	9.3
Basher	3	3.67	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	3.74	1.8	12.3	16.7	38.6	22.8	7.9
Bear Valley	4	3.00	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
Birchwood	13	3.80	0.0	7.7	7.7	53.8	7.7	23.1
Campbell Park	56	3.59	3.6 %	10.7 %	16.1 %	44.6 %	12.5 %	12.5 %
Chugiak	41	3.57	4.9	14.6	14.6	36.6	19.5	9.8
Downtown	9	3.88	0.0	11.1	0.0	66.7	11.1	11.1
Eagle River	85	3.71	0.0	16.5	18.8	27.1	25.9	11.8
Eagle River Valley	121	3.90	1.7	5.8	14.9	37.2	23.1	17.4
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.13	0.0 %	12.5 %	12.5 %	25.0 %	31.3 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	3.43	4.3	21.7	17.4	26.1	21.7	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	72.00	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	33.3	33.3
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	3.40	16.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7
Hillside East	26	3.73	0.0 %	3.8 %	26.9 %	42.3 %	11.5 %	15.4 %
Huffman/O'Malley	115	3.70	0.9	12.2	17.4	41.7	17.4	10.4
Mid-Hillside	41	3.84	2.4	4.9	17.1	48.8	19.5	7.3
Midtown	15	3.29	6.7	20.0	20.0	33.3	13.3	6.7
Mountain View	17	3.07	5.9	35.3	11.8	17.6	17.6	11.8
North Star	19	3.31	5.3	21.1	5.3	47.4	5.3	15.8
Northeast	158	3.65	4.4 %	13.3 %	15.8 %	36.1 %	23.4 %	7.0 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	3.85	3.3	6.7	18.3	31.7	28.3	11.7
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	3.74	1.5	10.8	18.5	44.6	20.0	4.6
Rogers Park	47	3.72	2.1	14.9	12.8	38.3	23.4	8.5
Russian Jack Park	54	3.40	1.9	20.4	18.5	33.3	13.0	13.0
Sand Lake	212	3.68	1.9 %	14.6 %	14.2 %	39.6 %	19.8 %	9.9 %
Scenic Foothills	82	3.69	0.0	12.2	19.5	39.0	17.1	12.2
South Addition	40	3.78	2.5	10.0	17.5	35.0	25.0	10.0
South Fork	16	3.93	0.0	6.3	12.5	56.3	18.8	6.3
Spenard	73	3.53	2.7	16.4	20.5	31.5	19.2	9.6
Taku/Campbell	101	3.68	3.0	11.9	16.8	40.6	19.8	7.9
Tudor Area	12	3.91	0.0 %	0.0 %	16.7 %	66.7 %	8.3 %	8.3 %
Turnagain	99	3.78	6.1	8.1	11.1	36.4	26.3	12.1
Turnagain Arm	3	3.67	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
University Area	62	3.88	1.6	6.5	14.5	46.8	21.0	9.7
Unknown ⁴	6	3.67	16.7	0.0	0.0	66.7	16.7	0.0

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate greater satisfaction while numbers below 3.00 indicate less satisfaction. Values are assigned as follows: Strongly dissatisfied=1; Dissatisfied=2; Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied=3; Satisfied=4; Strongly satisfied=5.

2. 20 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.

3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 4.01a. Fairness of Anchorage Police: Summary

Question 17a. Considering the following criminal justice participants and institutions, please indicate how you rate each one with respect to treating people fairly. — **Anchorage police**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	152	7.4 %	1.0	9.1 %
Fair	335	16.3	2.0	20.1
Good	739	35.9	3.0	44.3
Excellent	442	21.5	4.0	26.5
Don't know	390	19.0		
Total valid	2,058	100.0 %		
Missing	22			
Total	2,080			




Table 4.01b. Fairness of Anchorage Police: Detail

Question 17a. Considering the following criminal justice participants and institutions, please indicate how you rate each one with respect to treating people fairly. — **Anchorage police**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,058 ²	2.88	7.4 %	16.3 %	35.9 %	21.5 %	19.0 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	191	2.86	8.9 %	13.6 %	34.0 %	20.9 %	22.5 %
Airport Heights	43	2.86	7.0	18.6	39.5	20.9	14.0
Basher	3	3.00	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	2.74	8.8	18.4	33.3	15.8	23.7
Bear Valley	4	2.67	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
Birchwood	13	2.82	0.0	30.8	38.5	15.4	15.4
Campbell Park	56	2.86	10.7 %	14.3 %	39.3 %	23.2 %	12.5 %
Chugiak	41	2.70	12.2	14.6	39.0	14.6	19.5
Downtown	9	3.25	0.0	22.2	22.2	44.4	11.1
Eagle River	85	2.86	7.1	25.9	30.6	27.1	9.4
Eagle River Valley	123	3.06	6.5	13.0	26.8	30.9	22.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.91	12.5 %	6.3 %	25.0 %	25.0 %	31.3 %
Fairview	23	2.63	8.7	26.1	34.8	13.0	17.4
Fort Richardson	9	3.67	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	66.7
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	2.50	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
Government Hill	6	2.60	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7
Hillside East	26	3.22	0.0 %	3.8 %	46.2 %	19.2 %	30.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.96	7.8	14.7	37.1	26.7	13.8
Mid-Hillside	42	2.95	4.8	14.3	52.4	19.0	9.5
Midtown	13	2.75	7.7	15.4	61.5	7.7	7.7
Mountain View	17	3.00	11.8	11.8	29.4	35.3	11.8
North Star	19	2.87	10.5	10.5	36.8	21.1	21.1
Northeast	159	2.73	10.7 %	19.5 %	34.0 %	18.2 %	17.6 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	59	2.98	3.4	18.6	35.6	23.7	18.6
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	3.00	6.3	10.9	39.1	23.4	20.3
Rogers Park	46	2.97	2.2	15.2	43.5	17.4	21.7
Russian Jack Park	53	2.88	7.5	13.2	39.6	18.9	20.8
Sand Lake	212	2.90	5.7 %	17.0 %	35.4 %	20.3 %	21.7 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.95	4.8	15.7	36.1	21.7	21.7
South Addition	40	3.24	0.0	10.0	42.5	30.0	17.5
South Fork	16	2.77	12.5	12.5	37.5	18.8	18.8
Spennard	72	2.85	8.3	13.9	44.4	18.1	15.3
Taku/Campbell	100	2.78	9.0	21.0	29.0	21.0	20.0
Tudor Area	12	3.00	0.0 %	16.7 %	50.0 %	16.7 %	16.7 %
Turnagain	98	2.78	9.2	20.4	34.7	20.4	15.3
Turnagain Arm	3	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
University Area	63	2.90	6.3	14.3	41.3	19.0	19.0
Unknown ⁴	6	2.17	33.3	16.7	50.0	0.0	0.0

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of fairness while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor = 1; Fair = 2; Good = 3; Excellent = 4.
- 22 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.01a. Anchorage Police — Response to Calls for Assistance: Summary

Question 22a. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — Responding quickly to calls for help and assistance

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	192	9.3 %	1.0	11.6 %
Fair	425	20.6	2.0	25.7
Good	689	33.4	3.0	41.7
Excellent	346	16.8	4.0	20.9
Don't know	409	19.8		
Total valid	2,061	100.0 %		
Missing	19			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.01b. Anchorage Police — Response to Calls for Assistance: Detail

Question 22a. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Responding quickly to calls for help and assistance**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,061 ²	2.72	9.3 %	20.6 %	33.4 %	16.8 %	19.8 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	190	2.61	12.6 %	23.2 %	30.0 %	16.3 %	17.9 %
Airport Heights	44	2.76	6.8	29.5	25.0	22.7	15.9
Basher	3	2.00	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	2.62	12.3	21.1	31.6	14.9	20.2
Bear Valley	4	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Birchwood	13	2.67	7.7	7.7	53.8	0.0	30.8
Campbell Park	56	2.69	10.7 %	16.1 %	41.1 %	12.5 %	19.6 %
Chugiak	41	2.64	7.3	24.4	39.0	9.8	19.5
Downtown	9	3.00	0.0	33.3	22.2	33.3	11.1
Eagle River	85	2.70	10.6	25.9	34.1	20.0	9.4
Eagle River Valley	124	2.97	4.8	15.3	33.1	22.6	24.2
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.43	18.8 %	0.0 %	12.5 %	12.5 %	56.3 %
Fairview	21	2.56	19.0	9.5	47.6	9.5	14.3
Fort Richardson	9	3.00	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	55.6
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	2.67	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	3.00	0.0	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7
Hillside East	26	2.90	0.0 %	26.9 %	30.8 %	19.2 %	23.1 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.77	8.6	13.8	42.2	12.9	22.4
Mid-Hillside	41	2.89	4.9	17.1	51.2	17.1	9.8
Midtown	14	2.92	0.0	21.4	50.0	14.3	14.3
Mountain View	17	2.88	11.8	29.4	11.8	41.2	5.9
North Star	19	3.07	5.3	5.3	47.4	21.1	21.1
Northeast	159	2.60	13.8 %	20.8 %	32.7 %	15.1 %	17.6 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	2.83	8.3	20.0	26.7	23.3	21.7
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	2.80	10.9	14.1	31.3	20.3	23.4
Rogers Park	47	2.76	10.6	19.1	29.8	21.3	19.1
Russian Jack Park	55	2.73	9.1	18.2	29.1	16.4	27.3
Sand Lake	212	2.68	8.0 %	22.6 %	32.5 %	14.2 %	22.6 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.67	6.0	31.3	26.5	16.9	19.3
South Addition	39	3.03	2.6	15.4	41.0	23.1	17.9
South Fork	16	3.00	0.0	18.8	43.8	18.8	18.8
Spennard	72	2.66	6.9	23.6	41.7	9.7	18.1
Taku/Campbell	99	2.51	14.1	23.2	28.3	13.1	21.2
Tudor Area	12	2.78	0.0 %	33.3 %	25.0 %	16.7 %	25.0 %
Turnagain	100	2.79	10.0	20.0	33.0	22.0	15.0
Turnagain Arm	3	2.67	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
University Area	63	2.78	7.9	20.6	30.2	19.0	22.2
Unknown ⁴	6	2.00	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor=1; Fair=2; Good=3; Excellent=4.
- 19 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.02a. Anchorage Police — Not Using Excessive Force: Summary

Question 22a. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — NOT using excessive force

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	91	4.4 %	1.0	6.8 %
Fair	214	10.4	2.0	16.0
Good	673	32.8	3.0	50.3
Excellent	359	17.5	4.0	26.9
Don't know	717	34.9		
Total valid	2,054	100.0 %		
Missing	26			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.02b. Anchorage Police — Not Using Excessive Force: Detail

Question 22b. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **NOT using excessive force**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,054 ²	2.97	4.4 %	10.4 %	32.8 %	17.5 %	34.9 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	189	3.05	3.2 %	10.1 %	33.3 %	19.6 %	33.9 %
Airport Heights	44	2.93	2.3	18.2	27.3	18.2	34.1
Basher	3	2.00	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	2.86	4.4	14.9	30.7	14.9	35.1
Bear Valley	4	3.00	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0
Birchwood	12	2.78	0.0	25.0	41.7	8.3	25.0
Campbell Park	56	2.88	8.9 %	8.9 %	39.3 %	17.9 %	25.0 %
Chugiak	41	2.86	4.9	12.2	41.5	12.2	29.3
Downtown	9	2.50	0.0	44.4	11.1	11.1	33.3
Eagle River	83	3.00	6.0	10.8	32.5	22.9	27.7
Eagle River Valley	122	3.12	3.3	6.6	32.0	20.5	37.7
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.83	6.3 %	0.0 %	25.0 %	6.3 %	62.5 %
Fairview	21	3.00	4.8	0.0	52.4	9.5	33.3
Fort Richardson	9	3.00	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	2.67	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	2.50	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
Hillside East	26	3.38	0.0 %	0.0 %	30.8 %	19.2 %	50.0 %
Huffman/O'Malley	115	3.15	3.5	3.5	38.3	20.0	34.8
Mid-Hillside	42	3.04	0.0	9.5	42.9	11.9	35.7
Midtown	14	2.73	7.1	28.6	21.4	21.4	21.4
Mountain View	17	2.64	11.8	23.5	29.4	17.6	17.6
North Star	19	2.62	15.8	10.5	26.3	15.8	31.6
Northeast	160	2.88	6.9 %	11.9 %	26.9 %	18.1 %	36.3 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	3.10	3.3	6.7	36.7	20.0	33.3
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	3.17	0.0	7.7	29.2	16.9	46.2
Rogers Park	46	2.78	4.3	13.0	21.7	10.9	50.0
Russian Jack Park	55	2.94	1.8	12.7	29.1	12.7	43.6
Sand Lake	209	2.97	4.8 %	9.6 %	36.4 %	17.2 %	32.1 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.96	3.6	9.6	36.1	14.5	36.1
South Addition	39	2.88	2.6	20.5	23.1	17.9	35.9
South Fork	16	3.08	6.3	6.3	43.8	25.0	18.8
Spennard	73	2.98	4.1	6.8	37.0	13.7	38.4
Taku/Campbell	101	2.89	5.9	10.9	31.7	15.8	35.6
Tudor Area	12	3.00	0.0 %	16.7 %	33.3 %	16.7 %	33.3 %
Turnagain	100	3.01	6.0	8.0	34.0	21.0	31.0
Turnagain Arm	3	4.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
University Area	61	3.05	4.9	13.1	23.0	26.2	32.8
Unknown ⁴	6	2.20	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor = 1; Fair = 2; Good = 3; Excellent = 4.
- 26 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.03a. Anchorage Police — Being Helpful and Friendly: Summary

Question 22c. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — **Being helpful and friendly**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	138	6.7 %	1.0	7.9 %
Fair	318	15.5	2.0	18.2
Good	811	39.4	3.0	46.3
Excellent	484	23.5	4.0	27.6
Don't know	305	14.8		
Total valid	2,056	100.0 %		
Missing	24			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.03b. Anchorage Police — Being Helpful and Friendly: Detail

Question 22c. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Being helpful and friendly**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,056 ²	2.94	6.7 %	15.5 %	39.4 %	23.5 %	14.8 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	189	2.93	7.9 %	14.8 %	36.5 %	24.9 %	15.9 %
Airport Heights	42	3.03	2.4	16.7	40.5	23.8	16.7
Basher	3	3.00	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	2.92	7.0	14.0	41.2	21.1	16.7
Bear Valley	4	3.00	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Birchwood	13	2.80	0.0	23.1	46.2	7.7	23.1
Campbell Park	56	2.86	5.4 %	17.9 %	48.2 %	16.1 %	12.5 %
Chugiak	41	2.94	7.3	12.2	43.9	22.0	14.6
Downtown	9	2.88	0.0	44.4	11.1	33.3	11.1
Eagle River	85	2.81	12.9	12.9	45.9	21.2	7.1
Eagle River Valley	123	3.04	7.3	11.4	37.4	29.3	14.6
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	3.18	6.3 %	0.0 %	37.5 %	25.0 %	31.3 %
Fairview	21	2.84	4.8	19.0	52.4	14.3	9.5
Fort Richardson	9	2.80	0.0	11.1	44.4	0.0	44.4
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	2.67	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	2.67	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	3.29	0.0 %	7.7 %	42.3 %	30.8 %	19.2 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.97	6.0	14.7	39.7	24.1	15.5
Mid-Hillside	42	3.03	0.0	21.4	50.0	23.8	4.8
Midtown	14	2.83	7.1	14.3	50.0	14.3	14.3
Mountain View	17	2.88	5.9	41.2	5.9	41.2	5.9
North Star	19	2.76	10.5	21.1	36.8	21.1	10.5
Northeast	158	2.80	9.5 %	20.9 %	31.6 %	22.8 %	15.2 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	57	3.13	7.0	8.8	33.3	33.3	17.5
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	3.13	0.0	12.3	50.8	23.1	13.8
Rogers Park	47	2.90	6.4	19.1	38.3	23.4	12.8
Russian Jack Park	55	2.95	3.6	14.5	40.0	18.2	23.6
Sand Lake	211	2.94	8.1 %	13.3 %	40.8 %	24.2 %	13.7 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.99	4.8	14.5	42.2	22.9	15.7
South Addition	39	3.12	2.6	10.3	46.2	25.6	15.4
South Fork	16	2.77	6.3	25.0	31.3	18.8	18.8
Spennard	73	2.79	11.0	11.0	46.6	15.1	16.4
Taku/Campbell	101	2.69	10.9	26.7	21.8	22.8	17.8
Tudor Area	12	3.00	0.0 %	8.3 %	83.3 %	8.3 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	99	3.05	7.1	11.1	37.4	29.3	15.2
Turnagain Arm	3	3.33	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
University Area	63	3.16	1.6	14.3	39.7	31.7	12.7
Unknown ⁴	6	2.33	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0	0.0

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor=1; Fair=2; Good=3; Excellent=4.
- 24 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.04a. Anchorage Police — Treating People Fairly: Summary

Question 22d. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — *Treating people fairly*

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	148	7.2 %	1.0	9.4 %
Fair	310	15.1	2.0	19.7
Good	745	36.3	3.0	47.3
Excellent	373	18.2	4.0	23.7
Don't know	476	23.2		
Total valid	2,052	100.0 %		
Missing	28			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.04b. Anchorage Police — Treating People Fairly: Detail

Question 22d. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Treating people fairly**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,052 ²	2.85	7.2 %	15.1 %	36.3 %	18.2 %	23.2 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	188	2.84	8.0 %	14.4 %	41.0 %	17.6 %	19.1 %
Airport Heights	44	2.84	2.3	29.5	31.8	20.5	15.9
Basher	3	2.00	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
Bayshore/Klatt	113	2.69	9.7	17.7	35.4	13.3	23.9
Bear Valley	4	2.50	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
Birchwood	13	3.00	0.0	7.7	53.8	7.7	30.8
Campbell Park	56	2.76	7.1 %	17.9 %	42.9 %	12.5 %	19.6 %
Chugiak	41	2.76	12.2	9.8	46.3	14.6	17.1
Downtown	9	3.00	0.0	22.2	33.3	22.2	22.2
Eagle River	82	2.80	11.0	15.9	37.8	20.7	14.6
Eagle River Valley	123	2.92	6.5	15.4	30.9	22.8	24.4
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	3.11	6.3 %	0.0 %	31.3 %	18.8 %	43.8 %
Fairview	21	2.75	4.8	19.0	42.9	9.5	23.8
Fort Richardson	9	2.80	0.0	11.1	44.4	0.0	44.4
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	3.00	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
Government Hill	6	2.50	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
Hillside East	25	3.18	0.0 %	4.0 %	48.0 %	16.0 %	32.0 %
Huffman/O'Malley	115	3.01	6.1	11.3	35.7	24.3	22.6
Mid-Hillside	42	3.09	0.0	11.9	47.6	19.0	21.4
Midtown	14	2.82	7.1	14.3	42.9	14.3	21.4
Mountain View	17	2.60	11.8	41.2	5.9	29.4	11.8
North Star	19	2.80	10.5	21.1	21.1	26.3	21.1
Northeast	158	2.64	11.4 %	20.9 %	27.8 %	16.5 %	23.4 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	3.10	3.3	13.3	38.3	28.3	16.7
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	3.04	3.1	12.5	40.6	21.9	21.9
Rogers Park	47	2.74	4.3	19.1	21.3	12.8	42.6
Russian Jack Park	55	2.89	5.5	9.1	38.2	12.7	34.5
Sand Lake	210	2.88	6.2 %	12.9 %	41.9 %	16.2 %	22.9 %
Scenic Foothills	83	3.00	4.8	10.8	37.3	20.5	26.5
South Addition	39	2.90	2.6	23.1	33.3	20.5	20.5
South Fork	16	2.69	12.5	12.5	43.8	12.5	18.8
Spennard	73	2.72	11.0	12.3	43.8	12.3	20.5
Taku/Campbell	101	2.59	13.9	20.8	22.8	17.8	24.8
Tudor Area	12	2.88	0.0 %	25.0 %	25.0 %	16.7 %	33.3 %
Turnagain	100	3.00	7.0	9.0	41.0	23.0	20.0
Turnagain Arm	3	3.33	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
University Area	62	3.02	4.8	11.3	29.0	22.6	32.3
Unknown ⁴	6	2.20	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor = 1; Fair = 2; Good = 3; Excellent = 4.
- 28 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.05a. Anchorage Police — Investigating and Solving Crime: Summary

Question 22e. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — *Investigating/solving crime*

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	148	7.2 %	1.0	10.1 %
Fair	372	18.1	2.0	25.4
Good	665	32.4	3.0	45.5
Excellent	277	13.5	4.0	18.9
Don't know	592	28.8		
Total valid	2,054	100.0 %		
Missing	26			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.05b. Anchorage Police — Investigating and Solving Crime: Detail

Question 22e. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Investigating/solving crime**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,054 ²	2.73	7.2 %	18.1 %	32.4 %	13.5 %	28.8 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	190	2.69	7.9 %	18.9 %	32.6 %	12.6 %	27.9 %
Airport Heights	44	2.72	2.3	29.5	18.2	15.9	34.1
Basher	3	3.50	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Bayshore/Klatt	114	2.73	7.9	19.3	29.8	15.8	27.2
Bear Valley	4	2.50	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
Birchwood	13	2.67	7.7	15.4	7.7	15.4	53.8
Campbell Park	56	2.80	1.8 %	21.4 %	37.5 %	10.7 %	28.6 %
Chugiak	41	2.58	9.8	17.1	43.9	4.9	24.4
Downtown	9	2.57	11.1	22.2	33.3	11.1	22.2
Eagle River	83	2.76	9.6	14.5	41.0	14.5	20.5
Eagle River Valley	122	2.97	7.4	8.2	37.7	20.5	26.2
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.75	6.3 %	12.5 %	18.8 %	12.5 %	50.0 %
Fairview	21	2.71	4.8	14.3	42.9	4.8	33.3
Fort Richardson	9	3.00	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	3.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	2.67	0.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	50.0
Hillside East	26	2.73	3.8 %	23.1 %	15.4 %	15.4 %	42.3 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.80	7.8	12.1	38.8	12.9	28.4
Mid-Hillside	42	2.73	9.5	9.5	42.9	9.5	28.6
Midtown	13	2.80	7.7	15.4	38.5	15.4	23.1
Mountain View	17	2.71	11.8	29.4	11.8	29.4	17.6
North Star	19	2.77	5.3	21.1	26.3	15.8	31.6
Northeast	159	2.66	10.1 %	20.1 %	27.7 %	15.1 %	27.0 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	2.93	3.3	18.3	35.0	20.0	23.3
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	2.77	3.1	20.0	33.8	10.8	32.3
Rogers Park	46	2.59	8.7	17.4	28.3	8.7	37.0
Russian Jack Park	55	2.73	7.3	14.5	34.5	10.9	32.7
Sand Lake	209	2.61	10.0 %	23.0 %	25.8 %	14.4 %	26.8 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.67	7.2	19.3	31.3	10.8	31.3
South Addition	39	3.03	0.0	17.9	38.5	20.5	23.1
South Fork	15	2.83	6.7	13.3	46.7	13.3	20.0
Spennard	72	2.60	8.3	23.6	29.2	11.1	27.8
Taku/Campbell	100	2.62	8.0	19.0	33.0	9.0	31.0
Tudor Area	12	2.78	0.0 %	16.7 %	58.3 %	0.0 %	25.0 %
Turnagain	100	2.82	3.0	20.0	35.0	13.0	29.0
Turnagain Arm	3	3.50	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
University Area	63	2.80	6.3	15.9	27.0	15.9	34.9
Unknown ⁴	6	2.00	33.3	16.7	33.3	0.0	16.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor=1; Fair=2; Good=3; Excellent=4.
- 26 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.06a. Anchorage Police — Preventing Crime: Summary

Question 22f. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — Preventing crime

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	227	11.1 %	1.0	15.0 %
Fair	547	26.8	2.0	36.1
Good	565	27.7	3.0	37.3
Excellent	176	8.6	4.0	11.6
Don't know	528	25.8		
Total valid	2,043	100.0 %		
Missing	37			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.06b. Anchorage Police — Preventing Crime: Detail

Question 22f. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Preventing crime**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,043 ²	2.46	11.1 %	26.8 %	27.7 %	8.6 %	25.8 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	189	2.48	11.6 %	29.1 %	27.5 %	11.1 %	20.6 %
Airport Heights	43	2.39	11.6	34.9	11.6	14.0	27.9
Basher	3	2.67	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	113	2.49	8.8	27.4	25.7	8.8	29.2
Bear Valley	4	2.50	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
Birchwood	13	2.33	7.7	30.8	30.8	0.0	30.8
Campbell Park	55	2.47	10.9 %	21.8 %	29.1 %	7.3 %	30.9 %
Chugiak	40	2.39	12.5	25.0	37.5	2.5	22.5
Downtown	9	2.33	22.2	11.1	22.2	11.1	33.3
Eagle River	83	2.30	14.5	32.5	32.5	3.6	16.9
Eagle River Valley	123	2.58	8.9	23.6	33.3	9.8	24.4
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.64	12.5 %	12.5 %	31.3 %	12.5 %	31.3 %
Fairview	21	2.37	9.5	47.6	23.8	9.5	9.5
Fort Richardson	9	3.20	0.0	11.1	22.2	22.2	44.4
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	3.00	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
Government Hill	6	2.33	0.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	50.0
Hillside East	25	2.35	16.0 %	20.0 %	24.0 %	8.0 %	32.0 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.50	9.5	28.4	28.4	9.5	24.1
Mid-Hillside	42	2.68	4.8	21.4	31.0	9.5	33.3
Midtown	14	2.42	7.1	42.9	28.6	7.1	14.3
Mountain View	17	2.33	17.6	41.2	11.8	17.6	11.8
North Star	19	2.38	15.8	21.1	21.1	10.5	31.6
Northeast	158	2.42	13.3 %	27.2 %	24.1 %	10.1 %	25.3 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	2.66	8.3	23.3	33.3	13.3	21.7
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	2.44	12.3	24.6	29.2	7.7	26.2
Rogers Park	45	2.43	13.3	17.8	22.2	8.9	37.8
Russian Jack Park	53	2.44	9.4	22.6	26.4	5.7	35.8
Sand Lake	208	2.40	12.0 %	26.9 %	29.3 %	6.3 %	25.5 %
Scenic Foothills	82	2.47	7.3	29.3	28.0	6.1	29.3
South Addition	39	2.57	7.7	28.2	23.1	12.8	28.2
South Fork	16	2.64	12.5	12.5	31.3	12.5	31.3
Spenard	73	2.31	13.7	30.1	26.0	5.5	24.7
Taku/Campbell	99	2.40	12.1	27.3	27.3	7.1	26.3
Tudor Area	12	2.30	16.7 %	25.0 %	41.7 %	0.0 %	16.7 %
Turnagain	98	2.49	13.3	22.4	27.6	11.2	25.5
Turnagain Arm	3	2.50	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
University Area	63	2.49	6.3	31.7	25.4	7.9	28.6
Unknown ⁴	6	1.80	33.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	16.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor = 1; Fair = 2; Good = 3; Excellent = 4.
- 37 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.07a. Anchorage Police — Dealing with Neighborhood Problems: Summary

Question 22g. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — *Dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood*

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	152	7.4 %	1.0	11.4 %
Fair	401	19.5	2.0	30.0
Good	609	29.6	3.0	45.6
Excellent	174	8.5	4.0	13.0
Don't know	721	35.1		
Total valid	2,057	100.0 %		
Missing	23			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.07b. Anchorage Police — Dealing with Neighborhood Problems: Detail

Question 22g. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the *level and quality of police service* that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,057 ²	2.60	7.4 %	19.5 %	29.6 %	8.5 %	35.1 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	189	2.51	7.4 %	28.6 %	24.9 %	9.0 %	30.2 %
Airport Heights	44	2.58	2.3	29.5	18.2	9.1	40.9
Basher	3	2.00	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	113	2.63	11.5	15.9	25.7	14.2	32.7
Bear Valley	4	2.00	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
Birchwood	13	2.00	23.1	0.0	23.1	0.0	53.8
Campbell Park	56	2.64	7.1 %	17.9 %	30.4 %	8.9 %	35.7 %
Chugiak	38	2.64	5.3	21.1	31.6	7.9	34.2
Downtown	9	2.50	0.0	44.4	11.1	11.1	33.3
Eagle River	84	2.52	8.3	19.0	35.7	3.6	33.3
Eagle River Valley	124	2.77	5.6	11.3	33.1	8.9	41.1
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.63	6.3 %	12.5 %	25.0 %	6.3 %	50.0 %
Fairview	21	2.16	19.0	42.9	23.8	4.8	9.5
Fort Richardson	9	3.50	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	77.8
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	3.00	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
Government Hill	6	2.00	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	50.0
Hillside East	26	2.45	3.8 %	19.2 %	15.4 %	3.8 %	57.7 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.71	6.0	15.5	39.7	7.8	31.0
Mid-Hillside	42	2.81	2.4	14.3	40.5	7.1	35.7
Midtown	14	2.33	7.1	42.9	35.7	0.0	14.3
Mountain View	17	2.33	11.8	41.2	29.4	5.9	11.8
North Star	19	2.54	10.5	21.1	26.3	10.5	31.6
Northeast	160	2.47	13.1 %	18.8 %	29.4 %	8.1 %	30.6 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	2.84	5.0	16.7	36.7	15.0	26.7
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	2.73	4.6	15.4	27.7	9.2	43.1
Rogers Park	46	2.61	8.7	15.2	28.3	8.7	39.1
Russian Jack Park	55	2.35	12.7	20.0	23.6	5.5	38.2
Sand Lake	211	2.66	3.3 %	20.9 %	30.8 %	6.6 %	38.4 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.69	4.8	19.3	24.1	10.8	41.0
South Addition	39	3.11	0.0	10.3	41.0	17.9	30.8
South Fork	16	2.80	6.3	12.5	31.3	12.5	37.5
Spennard	72	2.42	9.7	22.2	25.0	5.6	37.5
Taku/Campbell	101	2.48	7.9	23.8	23.8	6.9	37.6
Tudor Area	12	2.56	8.3 %	16.7 %	50.0 %	0.0 %	25.0 %
Turnagain	99	2.64	10.1	14.1	36.4	9.1	30.3
Turnagain Arm	3	2.50	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
University Area	63	2.75	4.8	20.6	31.7	12.7	30.2
Unknown ⁴	6	2.00	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	66.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor=1; Fair=2; Good=3; Excellent=4.
- 23 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.08a. Anchorage Police — Maintaining Order in Neighborhood: Summary

Question 22h. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents?
 — **Maintaining order on the streets and sidewalks in your neighborhood**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
Poor	140	6.8 %	1.0	9.2 %
Fair	316	15.4	2.0	20.7
Good	791	38.5	3.0	51.7
Excellent	283	13.8	4.0	18.5
Don't know	526	25.6		
Total valid	2,056	100.0 %		
Missing	24			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.08b. Anchorage Police — Maintaining Order in Neighborhood: Detail

Question 22h. Considering the following topics, how would you rate the level and quality of police service that is provided to Anchorage residents? — **Maintaining order on the streets and sidewalks in your neighborhood**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,056 ²	2.80	6.8 %	15.4 %	38.5 %	13.8 %	25.6 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	189	2.66	9.0 %	20.6 %	37.0 %	11.6 %	21.7 %
Airport Heights	44	2.72	4.5	25.0	40.9	11.4	18.2
Basher	3	2.00	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
Bayshore/Klatt	114	2.85	8.8	9.6	36.8	16.7	28.1
Bear Valley	4	3.00	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Birchwood	13	2.83	0.0	7.7	38.5	0.0	53.8
Campbell Park	56	2.86	3.6 %	16.1 %	46.4 %	12.5 %	21.4 %
Chugiak	41	2.87	2.4	17.1	43.9	12.2	24.4
Downtown	9	3.17	0.0	11.1	33.3	22.2	33.3
Eagle River	85	2.83	5.9	15.3	47.1	12.9	18.8
Eagle River Valley	124	3.02	6.5	10.5	30.6	25.0	27.4
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	3.00	6.3 %	6.3 %	18.8 %	18.8 %	50.0 %
Fairview	21	2.33	19.0	23.8	38.1	4.8	14.3
Fort Richardson	9	2.75	11.1	0.0	22.2	11.1	55.6
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	3.00	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
Government Hill	6	3.00	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	50.0
Hillside East	25	3.18	0.0 %	4.0 %	28.0 %	12.0 %	56.0 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	2.96	3.4	11.2	38.8	15.5	31.0
Mid-Hillside	41	2.71	7.3	9.8	46.3	4.9	31.7
Midtown	14	2.46	21.4	7.1	64.3	0.0	7.1
Mountain View	17	2.31	23.5	29.4	29.4	11.8	5.9
North Star	18	2.64	5.6	22.2	44.4	5.6	22.2
Northeast	159	2.65	9.4 %	20.1 %	37.1 %	11.3 %	22.0 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	59	2.93	6.8	11.9	37.3	20.3	23.7
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	3.13	1.6	4.7	37.5	15.6	40.6
Rogers Park	47	2.76	6.4	17.0	34.0	12.8	29.8
Russian Jack Park	55	2.70	7.3	18.2	36.4	10.9	27.3
Sand Lake	212	2.83	3.3 %	18.9 %	38.2 %	12.7 %	26.9 %
Scenic Foothills	83	2.76	6.0	18.1	39.8	12.0	24.1
South Addition	39	3.19	0.0	10.3	46.2	25.6	17.9
South Fork	15	2.60	20.0	6.7	20.0	20.0	33.3
Spennard	73	2.56	11.0	21.9	35.6	9.6	21.9
Taku/Campbell	99	2.66	9.1	17.2	37.4	10.1	26.3
Tudor Area	12	2.91	0.0 %	25.0 %	50.0 %	16.7 %	8.3 %
Turnagain	100	2.85	9.0	10.0	46.0	16.0	19.0
Turnagain Arm	3	3.00	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
University Area	63	2.90	6.3	12.7	41.3	17.5	22.2
Unknown ⁴	5	2.00	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	40.0

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate a more positive assessment of level and quality of police service, while numbers below 3.00 indicate a more negative assessment. Values are assigned as follows: Poor=1; Fair=2; Good=3; Excellent=4.
- 24 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area; 1 of these respondents did not answer this question, and is omitted from the table.

Table 5.09a. Contact in Past Year with Police to Request Information: Summary

Question 23a. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Requesting information**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,521	74.2 %	0.0	76.9 %
Yes	457	22.3	1.0	23.1
Don't know	72	3.5		
Total valid	2,050	100.0 %		
Missing	30			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.09b. Contact in Past Year with Police to Request Information: Detail

Question 23a. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Requesting information**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,050 ²	0.23	74.2 %	22.3 %	3.5 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.24	72.6 %	23.2 %	4.2 %
Airport Heights	43	0.21	76.7	20.9	2.3
Basher	3	0.67	33.3	66.7	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.22	75.0	21.4	3.6
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.17	76.9	15.4	7.7
Campbell Park	56	0.23	71.4 %	21.4 %	7.1 %
Chugiak	39	0.31	64.1	28.2	7.7
Downtown	9	0.11	88.9	11.1	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.23	75.6	22.1	2.3
Eagle River Valley	122	0.24	75.4	23.8	0.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.08	75.0 %	6.3 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.36	60.9	34.8	4.3
Fort Richardson	9	0.22	77.8	22.2	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.12	84.6 %	11.5 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.12	87.1	12.1	0.9
Mid-Hillside	40	0.11	82.5	10.0	7.5
Midtown	14	0.38	57.1	35.7	7.1
Mountain View	17	0.35	64.7	35.3	0.0
North Star	19	0.32	68.4	31.6	0.0
Northeast	158	0.32	65.8 %	31.0 %	3.2 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.23	73.3	21.7	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.24	74.6	23.8	1.6
Rogers Park	46	0.29	69.6	28.3	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.24	70.4	22.2	7.4
Sand Lake	208	0.23	74.5 %	21.6 %	3.8 %
Scenic Foothills	80	0.11	87.5	11.3	1.3
South Addition	40	0.24	72.5	22.5	5.0
South Fork	16	0.25	75.0	25.0	0.0
Spennard	73	0.25	74.0	24.7	1.4
Taku/Campbell	101	0.22	75.2	21.8	3.0
Tudor Area	12	0.33	66.7 %	33.3 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	100	0.21	74.0	20.0	6.0
Turnagain Arm	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
University Area	64	0.32	65.6	31.3	3.1
Unknown ⁴	6	0.00	83.3	0.0	16.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.
- 30 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.10a. Contact in Past Year with Police to Report a Situation Requiring Police Intervention: Summary

Question 23b. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Reporting a situation requiring police intervention**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,408	68.6 %	0.0	70.9 %
Yes	579	28.2	1.0	29.1
Don't know	66	3.2		
Total valid	2,053	100.0 %		
Missing	27			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.10b. Contact in Past Year with Police to Report a Situation Requiring Police Intervention: Detail

Question 23b. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Reporting a situation requiring police intervention**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,053 ²	0.29	68.6 %	28.2 %	3.2 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.32	65.3 %	30.5 %	4.2 %
Airport Heights	44	0.40	59.1	38.6	2.3
Basher	3	1.00	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.32	65.2	30.4	4.5
Bear Valley	4	0.25	75.0	25.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.42	53.8	38.5	7.7
Campbell Park	55	0.38	58.2 %	36.4 %	5.5 %
Chugiak	40	0.38	57.5	35.0	7.5
Downtown	9	0.44	55.6	44.4	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.27	72.1	26.7	1.2
Eagle River Valley	121	0.17	82.6	16.5	0.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.15	68.8 %	12.5 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.38	56.5	34.8	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.17	83.3	16.7	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.24	73.1 %	23.1 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.23	76.7	22.4	0.9
Mid-Hillside	41	0.21	73.2	19.5	7.3
Midtown	14	0.31	64.3	28.6	7.1
Mountain View	17	0.41	58.8	41.2	0.0
North Star	19	0.37	63.2	36.8	0.0
Northeast	158	0.34	63.9 %	32.3 %	3.8 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.26	70.0	25.0	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	0.30	70.3	29.7	0.0
Rogers Park	46	0.29	69.6	28.3	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.42	53.7	38.9	7.4
Sand Lake	210	0.27	71.4 %	26.7 %	1.9 %
Scenic Foothills	81	0.26	72.8	25.9	1.2
South Addition	40	0.37	60.0	35.0	5.0
South Fork	16	0.31	68.8	31.3	0.0
Spennard	73	0.28	71.2	27.4	1.4
Taku/Campbell	101	0.27	69.3	25.7	5.0
Tudor Area	12	0.33	66.7 %	33.3 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	100	0.23	73.0	22.0	5.0
Turnagain Arm	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
University Area	62	0.32	67.7	32.3	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.
- 27 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.11a. Contact in Past Year with Police to Report Being Victimized by Crime: Summary

Question 23c. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Reporting being victimized by crime**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,780	86.9 %	0.0	89.9 %
Yes	200	9.8	1.0	10.1
Don't know	69	3.4		
Total valid	2,049	100.0 %		
Missing	31			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.11b. Contact in Past Year with Police to Report Being Victimized by Crime: Detail

Question 23c. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Reporting being victimized by crime**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,049 ²	0.10	86.9 %	9.8 %	3.4 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.10	85.3 %	10.0 %	4.7 %
Airport Heights	43	0.17	81.4	16.3	2.3
Basher	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.08	88.4	8.0	3.6
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.08	92.3	7.7	0.0
Campbell Park	56	0.15	80.4 %	14.3 %	5.4 %
Chugiak	40	0.16	77.5	15.0	7.5
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.09	89.5	9.3	1.2
Eagle River Valley	122	0.01	97.5	0.8	1.6
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.08	75.0 %	6.3 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.14	78.3	13.0	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.04	92.3 %	3.8 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.07	92.2	6.9	0.9
Mid-Hillside	41	0.05	87.8	4.9	7.3
Midtown	14	0.08	85.7	7.1	7.1
Mountain View	17	0.24	76.5	23.5	0.0
North Star	19	0.32	68.4	31.6	0.0
Northeast	158	0.16	81.0 %	15.8 %	3.2 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.09	86.7	8.3	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.03	95.2	3.2	1.6
Rogers Park	46	0.13	84.8	13.0	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.16	75.9	14.8	9.3
Sand Lake	209	0.08	89.5 %	8.1 %	2.4 %
Scenic Foothills	81	0.06	92.6	6.2	1.2
South Addition	40	0.13	82.5	12.5	5.0
South Fork	16	0.06	93.8	6.3	0.0
Spennard	73	0.21	78.1	20.5	1.4
Taku/Campbell	100	0.09	86.0	9.0	5.0
Tudor Area	12	0.08	91.7 %	8.3 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	99	0.09	86.9	8.1	5.1
Turnagain Arm	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
University Area	61	0.08	91.8	8.2	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.00	83.3	0.0	16.7

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.

2. 31 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.

3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.12a. Contact in Past Year with Police to Follow Up on Prior Report: Summary

Question 23d. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Following up on a previously filed report**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,760	86.0 %	0.0	89.2 %
Yes	214	10.5	1.0	10.8
Don't know	72	3.5		
Total valid	2,046	100.0 %		
Missing	34			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.12b. Contact in Past Year with Police to Follow Up on Prior Report: Detail

Question 23d. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Following up on a previously filed report**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,046 ²	0.11	86.0 %	10.5 %	3.5 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.13	83.2 %	12.1 %	4.7 %
Airport Heights	42	0.12	85.7	11.9	2.4
Basher	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.10	85.7	9.8	4.5
Bear Valley	4	0.25	75.0	25.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.08	84.6	7.7	7.7
Campbell Park	55	0.15	80.0 %	14.5 %	5.5 %
Chugiak	40	0.18	77.5	17.5	5.0
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.11	88.4	10.5	1.2
Eagle River Valley	122	0.07	92.6	6.6	0.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.08	75.0 %	6.3 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.19	73.9	17.4	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.13	80.8 %	11.5 %	7.7 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.08	91.4	7.8	0.9
Mid-Hillside	41	0.03	90.2	2.4	7.3
Midtown	14	0.08	85.7	7.1	7.1
Mountain View	17	0.24	76.5	23.5	0.0
North Star	19	0.21	78.9	21.1	0.0
Northeast	157	0.15	82.2 %	14.0 %	3.8 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.12	83.3	11.7	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.06	92.1	6.3	1.6
Rogers Park	45	0.07	91.1	6.7	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.16	77.8	14.8	7.4
Sand Lake	209	0.08	88.0 %	8.1 %	3.8 %
Scenic Foothills	81	0.09	90.1	8.6	1.2
South Addition	39	0.05	89.7	5.1	5.1
South Fork	16	0.13	87.5	12.5	0.0
Spennard	73	0.10	89.0	9.6	1.4
Taku/Campbell	101	0.13	83.2	12.9	4.0
Tudor Area	12	0.08	91.7 %	8.3 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	100	0.15	82.0	14.0	4.0
Turnagain Arm	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
University Area	61	0.08	88.5	8.2	3.3
Unknown ⁴	6	0.17	83.3	16.7	0.0

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.

2. 34 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.

3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.13a. Contact in Past Year with Police to Provide Witness Information: Summary

Question 23e. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Providing witness information about a crime being investigated**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,760	86.1 %	0.0	89.8 %
Yes	201	9.8	1.0	10.2
Don't know	83	4.1		
Total valid	2,044	100.0 %		
Missing	36			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.13b. Contact in Past Year with Police to Provide Witness Information: Detail

Question 23e. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Providing witness information about a crime being investigated**

Row percentages.


	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,044 ²	0.10	86.1 %	9.8 %	4.1 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.13	81.1 %	12.6 %	6.3 %
Airport Heights	43	0.12	83.7	11.6	4.7
Basher	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.11	83.9	10.7	5.4
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.09	76.9	7.7	15.4
Campbell Park	56	0.19	75.0 %	17.9 %	7.1 %
Chugiak	40	0.11	82.5	10.0	7.5
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.05	93.0	4.7	2.3
Eagle River Valley	121	0.08	90.9	8.3	0.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.19	81.3 %	18.8 %	0.0 %
Fairview	23	0.24	69.6	21.7	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	0.11	88.9	11.1	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.08	84.6 %	7.7 %	7.7 %
Huffman/O'Malley	115	0.05	92.2	5.2	2.6
Mid-Hillside	41	0.05	87.8	4.9	7.3
Midtown	14	0.23	71.4	21.4	7.1
Mountain View	17	0.06	94.1	5.9	0.0
North Star	19	0.05	94.7	5.3	0.0
Northeast	158	0.15	81.6 %	13.9 %	4.4 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.07	88.3	6.7	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.11	87.3	11.1	1.6
Rogers Park	45	0.14	84.4	13.3	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.12	79.6	11.1	9.3
Sand Lake	208	0.08	88.9 %	8.2 %	2.9 %
Scenic Foothills	81	0.06	90.1	6.2	3.7
South Addition	40	0.16	80.0	15.0	5.0
South Fork	16	0.06	93.8	6.3	0.0
Spennard	73	0.07	91.8	6.8	1.4
Taku/Campbell	100	0.13	82.0	12.0	6.0
Tudor Area	12	0.08	91.7 %	8.3 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	99	0.07	88.9	7.1	4.0
Turnagain Arm	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
University Area	60	0.12	88.3	11.7	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.00	83.3	0.0	16.7

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.
2. 36 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.14a. Contact in Past Year with Police on Traffic Violation: Summary

Question 23f. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Being stopped for a traffic violation**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,668	81.4 %	0.0	83.9 %
Yes	319	15.6	1.0	16.1
Don't know	63	3.1		
Total valid	2,050	100.0 %		
Missing	30			
Total	2,080			



**Table 5.14b. Contact in Past Year with Police
on Traffic Violation: Detail**

Question 23f. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Being stopped for a traffic violation**

Row percentages.


	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,050 ²	0.16	81.4 %	15.6 %	3.1 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	192	0.19	77.6 %	17.7 %	4.7 %
Airport Heights	42	0.07	90.5	7.1	2.4
Basher	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	111	0.13	83.8	12.6	3.6
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.38	61.5	38.5	0.0
Campbell Park	55	0.24	70.9 %	21.8 %	7.3 %
Chugiak	40	0.24	70.0	22.5	7.5
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.22	76.7	22.1	1.2
Eagle River Valley	124	0.24	75.0	24.2	0.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.08	75.0 %	6.3 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.32	65.2	30.4	4.3
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.12	84.6 %	11.5 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.11	87.9	11.2	0.9
Mid-Hillside	41	0.15	80.5	14.6	4.9
Midtown	14	0.07	92.9	7.1	0.0
Mountain View	17	0.12	88.2	11.8	0.0
North Star	19	0.16	84.2	15.8	0.0
Northeast	158	0.12	85.4 %	12.0 %	2.5 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.23	73.3	21.7	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.15	84.1	14.3	1.6
Rogers Park	46	0.16	82.6	15.2	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.18	74.1	16.7	9.3
Sand Lake	209	0.14	84.7 %	13.4 %	1.9 %
Scenic Foothills	82	0.20	78.0	19.5	2.4
South Addition	39	0.03	92.3	2.6	5.1
South Fork	16	0.19	81.3	18.8	0.0
Spennard	73	0.22	76.7	21.9	1.4
Taku/Campbell	101	0.10	85.1	9.9	5.0
Tudor Area	12	0.17	83.3 %	16.7 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	98	0.12	84.7	11.2	4.1
Turnagain Arm	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
University Area	61	0.18	82.0	18.0	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.17	83.3	16.7	0.0

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.
2. 30 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.15a. Contact in Past Year with Police While Being Detained Regarding a Crime: Summary

Question 23g. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Being detained regarding a crime**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,955	95.7 %	0.0	98.9 %
Yes	21	1.0	1.0	1.1
Don't know	66	3.2		
Total valid	2,042	100.0 %		
Missing	38			
Total	2,080			



**Table 5.15b. Contact in Past Year with Police While Being Detained
Regarding a Crime: Detail**

Question 23g. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Being detained regarding a crime**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,042 ²	0.01	95.7 %	1.0 %	3.2 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	189	0.01	95.2 %	0.5 %	4.2 %
Airport Heights	42	0.00	97.6	0.0	2.4
Basher	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.02	94.6	1.8	3.6
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.00	92.3	0.0	7.7
Campbell Park	56	0.00	96.4 %	0.0 %	3.6 %
Chugiak	40	0.00	92.5	0.0	7.5
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.00	97.7	0.0	2.3
Eagle River Valley	122	0.02	97.5	1.6	0.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.00	81.3 %	0.0 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.05	87.0	4.3	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.04	92.3 %	3.8 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.00	99.1	0.0	0.9
Mid-Hillside	41	0.00	92.7	0.0	7.3
Midtown	14	0.00	92.9	0.0	7.1
Mountain View	17	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
North Star	19	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Northeast	157	0.01	94.9 %	1.3 %	3.8 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.02	93.3	1.7	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.03	95.2	3.2	1.6
Rogers Park	45	0.02	95.6	2.2	2.2
Russian Jack Park	54	0.02	88.9	1.9	9.3
Sand Lake	208	0.00	97.6 %	0.5 %	1.9 %
Scenic Foothills	80	0.00	98.8	0.0	1.3
South Addition	39	0.00	94.9	0.0	5.1
South Fork	16	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Spennard	73	0.00	98.6	0.0	1.4
Taku/Campbell	101	0.03	92.1	3.0	5.0
Tudor Area	12	0.00	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	98	0.00	95.9	0.0	4.1
Turnagain Arm	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
University Area	61	0.02	98.4	1.6	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.17	83.3	16.7	0.0

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.

2. 38 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.


3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.16a. Contact in Past Year with Police While Being Arrested for a Crime: Summary

Question 23h. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Being arrested for a crime**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,961	95.9 %	0.0	99.1 %
Yes	18	0.9	1.0	.9
Don't know	65	3.2		
Total valid	2,044	100.0 %		
Missing	36			
Total	2,080			



**Table 5.16b. Contact in Past Year with Police
While Being Arrested for a Crime: Detail**

Question 23h. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Being arrested for a crime**

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,044 ²	0.01	95.9 %	0.9 %	3.2 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.01	94.7 %	1.1 %	4.2 %
Airport Heights	43	0.00	97.7	0.0	2.3
Basher	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	111	0.02	94.6	1.8	3.6
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.00	92.3	0.0	7.7
Campbell Park	55	0.00	96.4 %	0.0 %	3.6 %
Chugiak	40	0.00	92.5	0.0	7.5
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	86	0.01	96.5	1.2	2.3
Eagle River Valley	122	0.01	97.5	0.8	1.6
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.00	81.3 %	0.0 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.00	91.3	0.0	8.7
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.00	96.2 %	0.0 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.00	99.1	0.0	0.9
Mid-Hillside	41	0.00	92.7	0.0	7.3
Midtown	14	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Mountain View	17	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
North Star	19	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Northeast	158	0.01	95.6 %	0.6 %	3.8 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.02	93.3	1.7	5.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.03	95.2	3.2	1.6
Rogers Park	45	0.04	95.6	4.4	0.0
Russian Jack Park	54	0.02	90.7	1.9	7.4
Sand Lake	209	0.00	97.6 %	0.5 %	1.9 %
Scenic Foothills	80	0.00	98.8	0.0	1.3
South Addition	39	0.00	94.9	0.0	5.1
South Fork	16	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Spennard	73	0.00	98.6	0.0	1.4
Taku/Campbell	101	0.02	93.1	2.0	5.0
Tudor Area	12	0.00	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	98	0.00	95.9	0.0	4.1
Turnagain Arm	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
University Area	61	0.02	98.4	1.6	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.00	83.3	0.0	16.7

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.

2. 36 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.


3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.17a. Contact in Past Year with Police While Socializing: Summary

Question 23i. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Socializing with an officer in his/her civilian life**

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	1,522	74.6 %	0.0	77.1 %
Yes	453	22.2	1.0	22.9
Don't know	64	3.1		
Total valid	2,039	100.0 %		
Missing	41			
Total	2,080			



**Table 5.17b. Contact in Past Year with Police
While Socializing: Detail**

Question 23i. In the last twelve months, have you experienced any of the following types of contact with the Anchorage Police Department? — **Socializing with an officer in his/her civilian life**

Row percentages.


	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,039²	0.23	74.6 %	22.2 %	3.1 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	189	0.24	73.0 %	23.3 %	3.7 %
Airport Heights	43	0.19	79.1	18.6	2.3
Basher	3	0.67	33.3	66.7	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	112	0.34	65.2	33.0	1.8
Bear Valley	4	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.33	61.5	30.8	7.7
Campbell Park	56	0.17	80.4 %	16.1 %	3.6 %
Chugiak	41	0.32	61.0	29.3	9.8
Downtown	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Eagle River	84	0.40	58.3	38.1	3.6
Eagle River Valley	122	0.31	67.2	30.3	2.5
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.08	75.0 %	6.3 %	18.8 %
Fairview	23	0.27	69.6	26.1	4.3
Fort Richardson	9	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.31	69.2 %	30.8 %	0.0 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.23	75.9	23.3	0.9
Mid-Hillside	40	0.14	80.0	12.5	7.5
Midtown	13	0.17	76.9	15.4	7.7
Mountain View	17	0.13	82.4	11.8	5.9
North Star	19	0.16	84.2	15.8	0.0
Northeast	157	0.16	80.9 %	15.9 %	3.2 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.29	68.3	28.3	3.3
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	63	0.32	66.7	31.7	1.6
Rogers Park	45	0.18	82.2	17.8	0.0
Russian Jack Park	54	0.16	75.9	14.8	9.3
Sand Lake	209	0.22	76.1 %	21.5 %	2.4 %
Scenic Foothills	80	0.25	75.0	25.0	0.0
South Addition	39	0.30	66.7	28.2	5.1
South Fork	16	0.19	81.3	18.8	0.0
Spennard	72	0.20	79.2	19.4	1.4
Taku/Campbell	100	0.11	85.0	10.0	5.0
Tudor Area	12	0.25	75.0 %	25.0 %	0.0 %
Turnagain	98	0.16	79.6	15.3	5.1
Turnagain Arm	3	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0
University Area	61	0.25	75.4	24.6	0.0
Unknown ⁴	6	0.00	100.0	0.0	0.0

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.
2. 41 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.19a. Most Recent Experience with Anchorage Police Officer: Summary

Question 24. Considering your **most recent** experience with an APD officer, would you characterize the officer's behavior as **competent and appropriate**?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	180	8.8 %	0.0	11.2 %
Yes	1,427	70.2	1.0	88.8
Don't know	427	21.0		
Total valid	2,034	100.0 %		
Missing	46			
Total	2,080			



**Table 5.19b. Most Recent Experience with Anchorage Police Officer:
Detail**

Question 24. Considering your **most recent** experience with an APD officer, would you characterize the officer's behavior as **competent and appropriate**?

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,034 ²	0.89	8.8 %	70.2 %	21.0 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.87	10.5 %	71.6 %	17.9 %
Airport Heights	42	0.88	9.5	71.4	19.0
Basher	3	1.00	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	110	0.88	10.0	72.7	17.3
Bear Valley	4	1.00	0.0	50.0	50.0
Birchwood	13	0.85	15.4	84.6	0.0
Campbell Park	56	0.92	5.4 %	62.5 %	32.1 %
Chugiak	40	0.86	12.5	77.5	10.0
Downtown	8	1.00	0.0	62.5	37.5
Eagle River	83	0.88	10.8	75.9	13.3
Eagle River Valley	122	0.89	9.8	77.0	13.1
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	1.00	0.0 %	37.5 %	62.5 %
Fairview	22	0.78	18.2	63.6	18.2
Fort Richardson	8	1.00	0.0	50.0	50.0
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	1.00	0.0	100.0	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.75	16.7	50.0	33.3
Hillside East	25	1.00	0.0 %	80.0 %	20.0 %
Huffman/O'Malley	112	0.94	4.5	67.9	27.7
Mid-Hillside	42	0.94	4.8	69.0	26.2
Midtown	14	0.91	7.1	71.4	21.4
Mountain View	17	0.80	17.6	70.6	11.8
North Star	19	0.94	5.3	78.9	15.8
Northeast	158	0.90	7.6 %	69.0 %	23.4 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.90	8.3	71.7	20.0
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	0.95	4.6	80.0	15.4
Rogers Park	45	0.94	4.4	73.3	22.2
Russian Jack Park	53	0.88	7.5	56.6	35.8
Sand Lake	209	0.90	8.1 %	74.2 %	17.7 %
Scenic Foothills	82	0.89	8.5	67.1	24.4
South Addition	39	0.91	7.7	76.9	15.4
South Fork	15	0.82	13.3	60.0	26.7
Spenard	73	0.85	12.3	69.9	17.8
Taku/Campbell	100	0.75	19.0	56.0	25.0
Tudor Area	12	1.00	0.0 %	66.7 %	33.3 %
Turnagain	98	0.87	10.2	66.3	23.5
Turnagain Arm	3	1.00	0.0	100.0	0.0
University Area	61	0.93	4.9	70.5	24.6
Unknown ⁴	6	0.75	16.7	50.0	33.3

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect a higher perception of officer competence and appropriateness. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.
2. 46 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.20a. Confidence in Anchorage Police Department: Summary

Question 25. How much **confidence** do you have in the Anchorage Police Department?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
None	76	3.7 %	1.0	3.8 %
Very little	215	10.4	2.0	10.9
Some	556	27.0	3.0	28.1
Quite a lot	794	38.5	4.0	40.1
A great deal	338	16.4	5.0	17.1
Don't know	84	4.1		
Total valid	2,063	100.0 %		
Missing	15			
Total	2,078			




Table 5.20b. Confidence in Anchorage Police Department: DetailQuestion 25. How much **confidence** do you have in the Anchorage Police Department?

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹					
			None	Very little	Some	Quite a lot	A great deal	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,063 ²	3.56	3.7 %	10.4 %	27.0 %	38.5 %	16.4 %	4.1 %
Community Council area³								
Abbott Loop	190	3.52	3.7 %	13.2 %	22.6 %	41.1 %	14.7 %	4.7 %
Airport Heights	44	3.45	0.0	13.6	38.6	29.5	13.6	4.5
Basher	3	3.00	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	113	3.62	2.7	12.4	19.5	46.0	15.9	3.5
Bear Valley	4	3.25	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	3.85	0.0	7.7	15.4	61.5	15.4	0.0
Campbell Park	56	3.60	1.8 %	3.6 %	39.3 %	35.7 %	14.3 %	5.4 %
Chugiak	41	3.35	4.9	9.8	36.6	39.0	7.3	2.4
Downtown	9	3.33	0.0	22.2	44.4	11.1	22.2	0.0
Eagle River	85	3.40	4.7	16.5	29.4	30.6	17.6	1.2
Eagle River Valley	124	3.74	0.8	8.9	26.6	37.1	21.8	4.8
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	3.40	6.3 %	6.3 %	31.3 %	43.8 %	6.3 %	6.3 %
Fairview	22	3.43	0.0	4.5	54.5	27.3	9.1	4.5
Fort Richardson	9	3.50	0.0	22.2	22.2	22.2	22.2	11.1
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	4.33	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0
Government Hill	6	2.83	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.0
Hillside East	26	3.58	3.8 %	7.7 %	23.1 %	46.2 %	11.5 %	7.7 %
Huffman/O'Malley	115	3.55	3.5	10.4	27.0	37.4	15.7	6.1
Mid-Hillside	42	3.83	0.0	4.8	26.2	47.6	19.0	2.4
Midtown	14	3.23	7.1	14.3	21.4	50.0	0.0	7.1
Mountain View	17	2.87	5.9	23.5	41.2	11.8	5.9	11.8
North Star	19	3.39	10.5	10.5	15.8	47.4	10.5	5.3
Northeast	160	3.55	6.9 %	9.4 %	23.1 %	38.1 %	19.4 %	3.1 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	3.69	1.7	11.7	23.3	38.3	21.7	3.3
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	3.68	3.1	7.8	23.4	45.3	17.2	3.1
Rogers Park	47	3.68	4.3	2.1	27.7	44.7	14.9	6.4
Russian Jack Park	55	3.35	3.6	12.7	32.7	34.5	9.1	7.3
Sand Lake	211	3.53	5.7 %	8.5 %	28.0 %	38.9 %	16.6 %	2.4 %
Scenic Foothills	81	3.50	3.7	13.6	29.6	33.3	18.5	1.2
South Addition	40	3.79	0.0	5.0	30.0	42.5	20.0	2.5
South Fork	16	3.75	0.0	12.5	31.3	25.0	31.3	0.0
Spenard	73	3.56	2.7	11.0	24.7	41.1	13.7	6.8
Taku/Campbell	101	3.45	4.0	10.9	29.7	39.6	10.9	5.0
Tudor Area	12	3.91	0.0 %	0.0 %	25.0 %	50.0 %	16.7 %	8.3 %
Turnagain	100	3.52	6.0	12.0	23.0	35.0	19.0	5.0
Turnagain Arm	3	3.67	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
University Area	63	3.80	0.0	7.9	25.4	41.3	22.2	3.2
Unknown ⁴	6	3.33	0.0	16.7	50.0	16.7	16.7	0.0

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 3.00 indicate more confidence in Anchorage Police Department, while numbers below 3.00 indicate less confidence. Values are assigned as follows: None=1; Very little=2; Some=3; Quite a lot=4; A great deal=5.

2. 15 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.

3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.21a. Accessibility of Anchorage Police Department Services: Summary

Question 26. How accessible are the services of the Anchorage Police Department? (Accessible means the degree to which services of APD are made available to you.)




Table 5.21b. Accessibility of Anchorage Police Department Services: Detail

Question 26. How accessible are the services of the Anchorage Police Department? (Accessible means the degree to which services of APD are made available to you.)

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹				
			Not at all accessible	Somewhat inaccessible	Somewhat accessible	Very accessible	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,057 ²	3.13	5.7 %	10.0 %	29.7 %	31.3 %	23.4 %
Community Council area³							
Abbott Loop	190	3.07	7.4 %	9.5 %	32.6 %	30.0 %	20.5 %
Airport Heights	44	3.00	6.8	15.9	27.3	29.5	20.5
Basher	3	2.00	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	3.16	4.4	10.5	29.8	31.6	23.7
Bear Valley	4	2.33	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Birchwood	13	3.30	0.0	7.7	38.5	30.8	23.1
Campbell Park	56	3.20	5.4 %	7.1 %	32.1 %	33.9 %	21.4 %
Chugiak	40	3.00	2.5	20.0	37.5	25.0	15.0
Downtown	9	3.00	11.1	11.1	22.2	33.3	22.2
Eagle River	85	2.97	7.1	17.6	28.2	29.4	17.6
Eagle River Valley	124	3.28	5.6	4.0	26.6	35.5	28.2
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	2.60	18.8 %	6.3 %	18.8 %	18.8 %	37.5 %
Fairview	23	3.39	4.3	0.0	34.8	39.1	21.7
Fort Richardson	8	2.40	25.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	37.5
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	3.33	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	3.00	16.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	16.7
Hillside East	26	3.32	0.0 %	11.5 %	26.9 %	34.6 %	26.9 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	3.13	6.0	9.5	25.9	31.0	27.6
Mid-Hillside	41	3.46	0.0	4.9	36.6	43.9	14.6
Midtown	13	3.00	0.0	15.4	38.5	15.4	30.8
Mountain View	17	2.79	11.8	11.8	41.2	17.6	17.6
North Star	19	3.00	10.5	5.3	31.6	26.3	26.3
Northeast	160	3.13	5.0 %	12.5 %	33.8 %	33.1 %	15.6 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	59	3.19	10.2	5.1	25.4	40.7	18.6
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	64	3.18	4.7	9.4	29.7	32.8	23.4
Rogers Park	47	3.22	6.4	4.3	25.5	31.9	31.9
Russian Jack Park	55	3.03	3.6	12.7	23.6	21.8	38.2
Sand Lake	206	3.11	5.3 %	12.6 %	22.8 %	31.1 %	28.2 %
Scenic Foothills	83	3.24	3.6	7.2	28.9	31.3	28.9
South Addition	38	3.27	2.6	7.9	34.2	34.2	21.1
South Fork	16	3.08	12.5	0.0	37.5	31.3	18.8
Spenard	74	3.08	6.8	12.2	35.1	32.4	13.5
Taku/Campbell	101	3.03	6.9	7.9	35.6	23.8	25.7
Tudor Area	12	3.00	0.0 %	16.7 %	41.7 %	16.7 %	25.0 %
Turnagain	100	3.24	4.0	9.0	28.0	35.0	24.0
Turnagain Arm	3	2.33	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
University Area	63	3.26	3.2	11.1	23.8	36.5	25.4
Unknown ⁴	6	2.80	0.0	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7

- Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Numbers above 2.00 indicate an evaluation of a higher level of accessibility of APD services, while numbers below 2.00 indicate an evaluation of lesser accessibility. Values are assigned as follows: Not at all accessible = 1; Somewhat inaccessible = 2; Somewhat accessible = 3; Very accessible = 4.
- 23 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.
- All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community council areas.
- 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.

Table 5.22a. Contact by Family or Friend with Anchorage Police Officer in Past Twelve Months: Summary

Question 27. How anyone you know well, such as a family member or close friend, come into contact with an Anchorage police officer for any reason in the past 12 months?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Ratings	
			Value	Percentage of rated responses
No	865	42.1 %	0.0	46.1 %
Yes	1,011	49.2 %	1.0	53.9 %
Don't know	179	8.7 %		
Total valid	2,055	100.0 %		
Missing	25			
Total	2,080			




Table 5.22b. Contact by Family or Friend with Anchorage Police Officer in Past Twelve Months: Detail

Question 27. How anyone you know well, such as a family member or close friend, come into contact with an Anchorage police officer for any reason in the past 12 months?

Row percentages.

	N	Ratings average	Response category ¹		
			No	Yes	Don't know
Anchorage total	2,055 ²	0.54	42.1 %	49.2 %	8.7 %
Community Council area³					
Abbott Loop	190	0.53	43.7 %	49.5 %	6.8 %
Airport Heights	44	0.30	68.2	29.5	2.3
Basher	3	1.00	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bayshore/Klatt	114	0.58	38.6	52.6	8.8
Bear Valley	4	0.75	25.0	75.0	0.0
Birchwood	13	0.67	30.8	61.5	7.7
Campbell Park	55	0.54	41.8 %	49.1 %	9.1 %
Chugiak	41	0.65	34.1	63.4	2.4
Downtown	9	0.22	77.8	22.2	0.0
Eagle River	83	0.60	38.6	57.8	3.6
Eagle River Valley	124	0.54	41.1	48.4	10.5
Eklutna Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Elmendorf	16	0.50	43.8 %	43.8 %	12.5 %
Fairview	23	0.40	52.2	34.8	13.0
Fort Richardson	8	0.29	62.5	25.0	12.5
Girdwood	0	—	—	—	—
Glen Alps	3	0.33	66.7	33.3	0.0
Government Hill	6	0.17	83.3	16.7	0.0
Hillside East	26	0.48	50.0 %	46.2 %	3.8 %
Huffman/O'Malley	116	0.61	34.5	54.3	11.2
Mid-Hillside	42	0.46	52.4	45.2	2.4
Midtown	14	0.58	35.7	50.0	14.3
Mountain View	16	0.71	25.0	62.5	12.5
North Star	19	0.56	36.8	47.4	15.8
Northeast	160	0.57	38.1 %	51.3 %	10.6 %
Old Seward/Oceanview	60	0.57	41.7	55.0	3.3
Portage Valley	0	—	—	—	—
Rabbit Creek	65	0.52	43.1	46.2	10.8
Rogers Park	47	0.53	42.6	48.9	8.5
Russian Jack Park	54	0.38	55.6	33.3	11.1
Sand Lake	207	0.57	39.6 %	53.1 %	7.2 %
Scenic Foothills	83	0.57	39.8	53.0	7.2
South Addition	39	0.39	51.3	33.3	15.4
South Fork	16	0.73	25.0	68.8	6.3
Spennard	73	0.46	47.9	41.1	11.0
Taku/Campbell	100	0.59	36.0	51.0	13.0
Tudor Area	12	0.45	50.0 %	41.7 %	8.3 %
Turnagain	99	0.51	43.4	44.4	12.1
Turnagain Arm	3	0.67	33.3	66.7	0.0
University Area	62	0.49	46.8	45.2	8.1
Unknown ⁴	6	0.80	16.7	66.7	16.7

1. Categories were assigned numerical values to allow presentation of statistical averages. Higher numbers reflect more respondents reporting this kind of contact with police. Values are assigned as follows: No=0; Yes=1.

2. 25 of the 2,080 survey respondents did not answer this question, and are omitted from the table.

3. All 38 community council areas are included in this table, although there were no responses from Eklutna Valley, Girdwood, or Portage Valley. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson are included, but are not community

4. 6 questionnaires could not be coded for community council area.