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Executive Summary – Survey of Businesses

Overall Satisfaction with the Vancouver Police Department
In total, nine in ten (90%) business owners and/or managers were very or somewhat satisfied with the service provided by the VPD in 2016. This is consistent with overall satisfaction ratings over the previous three years, although there was a notable improvement for being ‘very satisfied’ versus last year.

Across Districts, the highest overall satisfaction ratings were in District 3 (95%) and District 4 (94%), yet ratings were also strong in District 2 (89%) and District 1 (85%).

Satisfaction with the service provided by the VPD was based on the general perception that the VPD was doing a good job (21%) and the department’s quick response/service to businesses (20%). Neutral or negative comments were typically from those with little or no contact with the VPD (14%) and those who consider the police response slow (7%) or ineffective (5%).

Responsiveness, Meeting Safety Needs, and Addressing Street Disorder
Perceptions of the VPD’s ability to meet the business community’s safety needs and respond quickly to emergency situations rebounded from the slight declines seen in 2015. The VPD’s ability to address street disorder remained consistent with 2015.

The proportion of businesses who gave a good rating (4 or 5 out of 5) for the VPD responding to emergency situations quickly improved significantly in 2016 (to 82%, up nine points). Positive ratings for meeting the business community’s safety needs also increased significantly from 2015, by seven points to 79%. Ratings for addressing street disorder also rose but not significantly since 2015 (to 68%, up three points).

Time Devoted to Addressing Crime Problems
In general, theft remained the area where business owners and managers felt the VPD currently spends enough time. Around two-thirds (69%) thought the VPD spends enough time addressing thefts of vehicles, while 64% believed the police were devoting sufficient time to the problem of theft from vehicles. Over one-half believed that enough time was being allocated to theft from businesses (57%) and theft from homes (56%).

The crime-related areas that were seen by business managers as priorities where the VPD should spend more time included sexual crimes (63%) followed by gangs and drug use (both at 59%), crimes targeting seniors (58%), and youth violence (57%).
Impressions of the VPD on Key Reputation Dimensions

Business owners and managers evaluated the VPD on seven attributes that reflect key dimensions of the VPD’s service. Consistent with results from 2015, about eight in ten business owners and managers Citywide perceived the VPD to be professional (82%) as well as respectful (79%), knowledgeable (78%) and trustworthy (78%). About seven in ten business owners and managers consider the VPD to be visible (72%) and fair (71%). The lowest rated quality of the VPD was accountability (67%), although this rating has been gradually improving over the last four years.

Contact with the VPD

Roughly four in ten (42%) business owners and managers had contact with the VPD in the 12 months preceding the 2016 survey. Citywide, 86% of those who had contact with the VPD were very or somewhat satisfied with the service received, down slightly but not significantly from the 90% achieved across the previous three years. There was a notable but not significant drop of 13 points in satisfaction for District 2 in 2016.

The business managers who were satisfied with the VPD’s service were most likely to mention the quick response and service by the police (28%) as a leading reason for satisfaction. Other common themes for satisfaction include a general sense that the VPD were doing a good job (17%), being professional (15%), and the caring and helpfulness of officers (15%).

Perceptions of Safety

Consistent with results in previous years, more than six in ten (63%) business owners and managers felt the neighbourhood in which their business was located was safe relative to other neighbourhoods in the city. Safe ratings in District 4 (88%) continued to be significantly higher than in other Districts, while District 2 continues to have the lowest proportion of safe ratings (29%). Notably, the percentage of District 1 business managers who said that their business was in an unsafe neighbourhood increased significantly from last year (from 10% to 22%).

More than two in ten (22%) of those who felt their business neighbourhoods were safe compared with other neighbourhoods mentioned the low crime rate in the area. Two in ten (19%) indicated that their neighbourhood was quiet or there were no problems, leading to the perception of relative safety.

Concerns with drug-related activities and homelessness/panhandlers (both at 17%) were the most frequently mentioned reasons for considering a business’ neighbourhood to be less safe than other neighbourhoods, followed by property theft and break-ins (13%).
Perceptions of Violent Crime and Property Crime in the Business Neighbourhood

Generally in line with results from last year, 82% of business managers Citywide said the level of violent crime in their neighbourhood had remained the same in the year preceding the survey. Fewer than one in ten (9%) reported that the level of violent crime in their neighbourhood had increased, while a similar proportion (7%) believed that violent crime had decreased. Compared to those in other Districts, business owners and managers in District 3 were significantly more likely to say that violent crime had decreased (18%) in their neighbourhood in the past 12 months.

When asked about the levels of property crime in their business’ neighbourhood, more than seven in ten (72%) of business owners and managers Citywide said that property crime rates had stayed about the same in the 12 months preceding the survey, consistent with results from 2015. Almost two in ten (18%) believed that property crime rates had increased, while roughly half that proportion (8%) felt that rates had decreased, again very similar to the levels in 2015.

Far more business owners and managers in District 1 felt there had been an increase in property crime in their neighbourhood, (24%, up nine points since 2015).

As in previous years, break and enters were considered to be by far the most important crime-related problem on a neighbourhood level, mentioned by almost four in ten (38%) business owners and managers Citywide.

Perceptions of Violent Crime and Property Crime in the City

More than six in ten (62%) business owners and managers Citywide indicated that violent crime levels stayed about the same in the City of Vancouver in the 12 months prior to the survey, on par with 2015. Almost one in ten (9%) thought that violent crime in the City had decreased, also consistent with a year ago. However, nearly three in ten (28%) thought that violent crime had increased, an increase of five points from 2015 although not a significant difference.

As in previous years, the proportion of business owners and managers in 2016 who said that the levels of violent crime increased across the City was much higher than the proportion who said there was an increase in violent crime within their own neighbourhood (28% versus 9% respectively). This once again points to a perceptual disconnect between what business owners and managers see in their own neighbourhoods and what they perceive as happening in the rest of the City in general.

As in 2015, business owners and managers were more likely to say that rates of property crime had stayed the same over the past twelve months in the City as a whole (65%). In 2016, one-quarter (25%) indicated that property crimes in the City had increased, consistent with the prior year.

Drugs (30%) were seen as the most important crime-related problem in the City by business owners and managers, followed by break & enter and thefts (18%).
Experiences with Crime at the Business
One-quarter of business owners and managers (26%) indicated that a crime had occurred at their workplace in the 12 months prior to the survey, up slightly from 22% in 2015.

The rate of crime experienced in Districts 1 and 2 (32% each) was significantly higher than in District 4 (19%). There has been a significant increase in the proportion of business managers in District 1 who said that a crime had occurred at their workplace in the past 12 months over the last four years (from 19% in 2013 to 32% in 2016).

Over one-half (55%) of business owners or managers who had a crime occur at their business said the crime was against the business itself, with another one-third (35%) reporting that the crime was against a staff member. Consistent with previous years, the majority (78%) of these crimes experienced by businesses were property crimes, as opposed to violent crimes.

Overall, fewer that two-thirds (63%) of crimes were reported in 2016. The top reason for not reporting a crime to the police was a perception that the incident was not serious enough, followed by feeling that the police could not do anything about the crime anyways.

Importance of Crime Reduction Programs and Services
Consistent with previous years’ results, a very small proportion (2%) of business owners and managers said that they or their staff participated in a program or received training in any of the crime reduction programs sponsored by the VPD.

Business owners and managers rated the importance of 12 different VPD programs and services. The programs perceived to be the most important overall (based on very and somewhat important ratings) were Victim Services (96%), DTES Foot Patrols (94%), Community Policing Centres (92%) and Block Watch (91%).

The Granville Entertainment District Street Closures (69%) and the Beach Patrol (71%) were perceived to be the least important programs from business owners/managers' point of view, but were still rated as quite important overall.
Keeping the Public Informed
Businesses’ ratings of the VPD’s performance on generating news stories informing the public remained generally consistent with previous years on all four subjects of major arrests, drug crackdowns, crime prevention, and crime reduction. The only significant difference was the improvement for crime reduction where the positive rating increased from 44% to 51% over the past year.

Citywide, business owners and managers indicated that the VPD was best at communicating information about major arrests (66% gave a rating of 4 or 5 out of 5) followed by the other three subject areas which received positive ratings between 50%-53%. Of note, District 3 tended to have the most positive ratings on average across the four topics, followed by District 2 where positive ratings for all four of these areas increased significantly compared to the prior year (after declining in 2015).

Business owners and managers were also asked which of ten media sources they used for obtaining information regarding the VPD in the previous 12 months. Social media, a new option in 2016, was cited as the top media source used for information about the VPD (50%). As in previous years, the top sources of information among traditional media channels were TV (46%), radio (40%) and the Vancouver Sun (36%).

Portrayal of VPD in the Media
Roughly one-half (51%) of business owners and managers gave positive ratings (4 or 5 out of 5) to the portrayal of the VPD in the local media, which is consistent with the perception from 2015.

Use and Satisfaction with the VPD Website
Over one-quarter (27%) of business managers or owners Citywide have ever visited the VPD website. Consistent with previous years, two-thirds (67%) visited the website for general information. Almost one-half (46%) percent used the VPD website for crime reporting purposes, while just over one-third either checked out current news on the public affairs page (36%) or searched for crime prevention tips (36%).

Seven in ten (69%) business owners or managers who visited the VPD website evaluated it favourably (gave a rating of 4 or 5 out of 5). This result is marginally weaker, but not significantly so, compared to 2015 (73%).
Most Common Recommendation from Businesses to Improve Service
Consistent with historical results, the most frequent suggestion that business managers gave for improving service was to increase the visibility and presence of police in the neighbourhood (29%). This was followed by better communication/outreach to businesses (12%). Increased police presence was mentioned significantly more by business managers in District 2 than those in District 4.

One-quarter of business managers did not have any suggestions for improving VPD service in their neighbourhoods.

Contact with Non-Police Agency
Seven percent of business owners and managers contacted an organization other than the police to discuss a crime or nuisance problem. The Gastown Patrol and COV Health Department were the more commonly contacted alternative agencies.
Survey Objectives

The objectives of this survey, which was previously conducted biannually from 2004 to 2008 and now annually (starting in 2009) were to:

- Assess, among business owners and managers, perceptions of crime and feelings of safety in each of the four VPD Patrol Districts.
- Determine the prevalence of criminal victimization at businesses and the extent to which crimes are reported to the police.
- Assess perceptions of VPD officers and the extent to which businesses see officers actively working to stop crime problems.
- Assess awareness of VPD policing and crime-reduction initiatives.
- Assess overall satisfaction with the services provided by the VPD.
- Solicit recommendations regarding how VPD can improve policing services for businesses.
Survey Method & Data Analysis

A similar survey was conducted in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015. To maintain consistency across waves of the survey, the same method was employed in 2016 as in previous years. Starting in 2009, the survey has been conducted annually; the 2016 survey is largely the same as the one used in 2015, with a few notable updates. Results are reported from 2013 to 2016, where applicable.

Details of sampling frame and strategies implemented to ensure representativeness of the sample are outlined below:

- The sampling frame for this survey was comprised of all businesses located within the VPD Patrol District boundaries.
- Businesses were randomly selected from each of the four Patrol Districts.
- Only owners or managers of the business were interviewed.
- To ensure reliable samples were collected in each Patrol District, 100 interviews were conducted in each District (with 101 interviews collected in District 4).
- Results were weighted based on the number of businesses in each District to ensure that the aggregate sample reflected the business distribution across the Districts.

This survey contained approximately 80 questions and took an average of 20 minutes to complete. In total, 401 surveys were completed between October 25th and November 8th, 2016.

The Citywide results have a margin of error of +/- 4.9% at the 95% level of confidence. This margin of error assumes a 50/50 distribution on a dichotomous question. In most cases, the margin of error will be smaller than the maximum margin of error, because the distribution will be further from a 50/50 split.

Statistical significance testing is used to analyze the difference in results between Districts and between years. Differences that are statistically significant are not likely to occur by chance at a certain level of probability (usually 95%). Where applicable, we noted in the report the results that are significantly different between Districts or have changed over time.

1 i.e., if the same sample were collected 20 times, 19 times the value would fall within the observed result plus or minus the margin of error.
Detailed Survey Results

4.1 Perceptions of the Vancouver Police Department
4.1.1 OVERALL SATISFACTION

**Q1A. Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by the VPD? (Citywide, 2016)**

Overall, nine in ten business owners and/or managers (90%) were satisfied with the service provided by the VPD. This is consistent with the overall satisfaction levels of the previous three years.

District 3 (95%) and District 4 (94%) have the highest levels of overall satisfaction, with the District 3 score showing a notable five-point increase since 2015. Overall satisfaction with Districts 1 and 2 remain fairly consistent, although lower than the other two Districts.

To understand the key sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the VPD services, we asked business managers why they rated the service as they did. Responses were recorded verbatim, then content-coded into the categories on the slide that follows.

*Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.*
The primary reasons for satisfaction with the VPD were an overall sense of the police doing a good job (21%) and providing quick response/service (20%). Business managers in District 4 were significantly more likely to indicate the police are caring/helpful compared with the managers in District 1. Businesses in District 3 were more likely to be satisfied due to high police visibility than those in other Districts.

Conversely, the primary reason for being dissatisfied with the VPD is that there was little or no contact with police (14%). This was followed by the police being slow to respond (7%), mentioned particularly in District 1 (12%). Police being ineffective (5%) is the next most common negative response.

### Reasons for Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Comments</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing a good job/ I am satisfied</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick response/ service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/ helpful</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low crime area/ Vancouver is safe</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are visible/ patrol a lot</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police presence has helped reduce crime/ solve problems</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Comments</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No contact/ little interaction with police</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow response/ service</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police ineffective/ response ineffective</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should focus on homelessness /drug use violence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police resources need to be reviewed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough police presence/need more staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dispatch</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All participants (n=401).
Values circled are significantly different from the squared values in the same row at a 95% confidence interval.
Note: Responses mentioned by less than 2% of all participants not shown.
Perceptions of the VPD’s ability to meet the business community’s safety needs and to respond quickly in emergency situations have each rebounded from the slight declines seen in 2015. Ratings for addressing street disorder remain consistent with the past few years; ratings are quite positive, though not as strong as the other two service areas.
The proportion of business owners and managers who positively rated the VPD’s ability to respond to emergencies quickly increased significantly in District 4 in 2016 compared with 2015, and also increased notably (though not significantly) in District 1 and District 3.

**Responding to Emergencies Quickly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of the VPD’s ability to meet the business community’s safety needs remained mostly consistent with results from last year for Districts 3 and 4. There was a positive though not significant increase in District 1, back to the level seen in 2014. Meanwhile, District 2 showed a significant increase from 2015 scores.

**Meeting Business Community’s Safety Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business owners’ and managers’ perceptions of the VPD’s ability to address street disorder increased slightly from 2015 for Districts 1, 3, and 4. There was a more notable but not statistically significant improvement in the rating for District 2 in 2016.

**Addressing Street Disorder**

- Positive ratings (4, 5)
- Negative ratings (1, 2)
The majority of business owners and managers believe the police are devoting sufficient time to the problem of theft of vehicles (69%) and theft from vehicles (64%). Theft from businesses and theft from homes followed a similar pattern with over one-half feeling that enough time is already being devoted to these areas (57% and 56% respectively).

Sexual crimes (63%) tops the list of areas where business owners and managers felt more time should be spent by police to address this concern. This was followed by gangs and drug use (both at 57%) comprising the top three areas where business owners and managers felt that more time should be spent.
Consistent with previous years, theft remains the area where most business owners and managers believe enough time is being spent (be it theft from homes, from businesses, or from/of vehicles). These proportions have increased slightly from last year.

Most areas show non-significant differences from year to year in terms of the proportion of business owners and managers who believed the VPD should spend more time addressing the issue.
Top seven crime-related problems the VPD should spend more time addressing by District

There were notable differences between Districts when looking at crime-related areas where business managers felt the VPD should spend more time. Sexual crimes were the top priority for Districts 2 and 4 with crimes targeting seniors, gangs, youth violence, and violent crime also higher priority in these Districts. Drug use was the top problem seen needing more attention in Districts 1 and 3. Sexual crimes, youth violence, violent crime, and gangs were also among the top crime-related problems in Districts 1 and 3.
4.1.3 PERCEIVED QUALITIES OF THE VPD

Q4. How well do the following qualities best describe the Vancouver Police Department?

Citywide (2016)

Business owners and managers evaluated the VPD on seven qualities that reflect key dimensions of the Vancouver Police Department’s service. All of these attributes received positive ratings (4 or 5 out of 5) from the majority of businesses, consistent with 2015 results.

Citywide, about eight in ten business managers perceived the VPD to be professional (82%) as well as respectful (79%), knowledgeable (78%), and trustworthy (78%). About seven in ten business owners and managers also believed the VPD to be visible (72%) and fair (71%). The lowest rated quality was accountability (67%), although this rating has improved significantly over the past four years.

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
Perceived Qualities of the VPD by District

Business owners and managers in most Districts tended to perceive the VPD primarily as professional, with the exception of District 2 where businesses rated the VPD higher for being respectful than for being professional.

Businesses in District 3 tend to give higher overall ratings to the VPD than those in other Districts. The higher overall rating in District 3 is primarily driven by relatively high assessments of being trustworthy and visible.

Those in District 4 are much less likely than those in any other District to rate VPD officers as visible.
Forty-two percent of business managers Citywide had contact with the VPD in the 12 months preceding the 2016 survey, consistent with 41% in 2015. Those in Districts 1 and 2 were more likely to have had contact with the Vancouver Police Department in 2016, although these differences by District are not significant.

District 4 continues to have the lowest number of reported contacts with the VPD in 2016 (36%).

Note: The full text of the question emphasized contact with the VPD directly, not with a 911 dispatcher. The full text of the question, as it was read to participants in the 2016 survey, was:

*This next section will ask some questions about any contact you may have had with the Vancouver Police Department because of your business. This could include a conversation with a police officer in person or on the phone, a call to the police non-emergency number or any number of other ways that you may have been in contact with the Vancouver Police Department.*

*We are interested here in your contact with the members of the Vancouver Police Department – not contact with a 911 dispatcher or police from other jurisdictions.*
4.1.4.2 Satisfaction with Service Received (Among those who contacted VPD)

Citywide, 86% of the business managers who had contact with the VPD in 2016 were satisfied with the service they received. This is slightly lower than the overall satisfaction ratings from the previous three years (90% each year).

Satisfaction ratings dropped by 13 percentage points in District 2 compared with 2015 results. Results in other Districts were not significantly different year over year.

*Q6A. Overall, how satisfied were you with the service your business received from the Vancouver Police Department? (Citywide, 2016)*

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Business managers who had contact with the VPD in the 12 months preceding the survey (n=172 for 2016, n=179 for 2015; n=171 for 2014; n=192 for 2013)

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
## Reasons for Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

### Positive Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick response/service</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing a good job/I am satisfied</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/helpful</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue resolved</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough investigation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Negative Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police ineffective/response ineffective</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow response/service</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dispatch</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue not solved</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough police presence/need more staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should focus on homelessness/drug use violence</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police resources need to be reviewed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of info about case</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor telephone service</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not caring/not helpful</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The business managers who were satisfied with the VPD’s service were most likely to mention the quick response and service by the police (28%) as their reason for satisfaction. The other leading themes contributing to satisfaction with the VPD include doing a good job (17%), being professional (15%), and caring/helpfulness of officers (15%).

The primary sources of dissatisfaction with VPD contact were due to feeling that there was an ineffective police response (8%) and police were slow to respond or provide service (7%). The next leading reason for dissatisfaction was that there was no dispatch (5%).

*Base: Business managers who had contact with the VPD in the past 12 months, 2016 n=172.*

*Note: Responses mentioned by less than 2% of all participants not shown.*

*Values circled are significantly different from the squared values in the same row at a 95% confidence interval.*
4.2 Perceptions of Safety and Crime
Perceptions of businesses’ neighbourhood safety in 2016 remained generally high, consistent with the last few years. More than six in ten business managers (63%) felt their business’ neighbourhood was safe relative to other neighbourhoods in the City.

That said, it is not surprising that some Districts were perceived to be safer than others. Safe ratings in District 4 (88%) continue to be significantly higher than other Districts. District 2 continues to have the lowest proportion of safe ratings (29%), on par with its unsafe rating (28%). In 2016, the percentage of District 1 business managers who said that their business was in an unsafe neighbourhood increased significantly from 2015 (from 10% to 22%).

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.1.2.2 Reasons for the Perceived Level of Safety

More than two in ten (22%) of those who felt their business neighbourhoods were relatively safe mentioned the lack of criminal activity in the area. Almost as many mentioned that the area is relatively quiet and there are no problems (19%). Police presence and patrols (8%) and lots of people/populated area (7%) are other key reasons for the perceived safety in the business’ neighbourhood.

The reasons a neighbourhood was considered relatively unsafe were more varied. Concerns regarding drug-related activities (17%) and homelessness/panhandlers (17%) were the top two reasons for considering a neighbourhood unsafe. The next strongest contributor to feeling unsafe is property theft/break-ins (13%).

District 4 business owners are less likely to mention each of the top three reasons for considering a neighbourhood unsafe than those in any other District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Comments</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low crime area/safe</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems/quiet</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police presence/patrols</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of people/populated area</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private security/patrols</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Comments</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug-related activities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/panhandlers</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property theft/break-ins</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High crime area (non-specified)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious people around</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the safest area but not the worst</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be better/more police needed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General feelings of unease</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All participants (n=401).
Note: Responses mentioned by less than 2% of all participants not shown.
Values circled are significantly different from the squared values in the same row at a 95% confidence interval.
4.1.2.3 Violent Crime in the Business Neighbourhood

Q9A. *In the past 12 months, would you say the level of violent crime in your business’ neighbourhood has... (Citywide)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decreased significantly</th>
<th>Decreased somewhat</th>
<th>Stayed about the same</th>
<th>Increased somewhat</th>
<th>Increased significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3% 2% 1% 2%</td>
<td>6% 10% 7% 5%</td>
<td>78% 78% 77% 82%</td>
<td>5% 5% 7% 8%</td>
<td>1% 1% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2013 %**
- **2014 %**
- **2015 %**
- **2016 %**

Business owners and managers were asked about their perceptions of violent and property crime *at the neighbourhood level*. These results are reported in the next two slides.

Eight in ten (82%) business managers (82%) said the level of violent crime in their neighbourhood had remained about the same in the year preceding the survey, slightly higher than 2015 results. Less than one in ten (9%) reported that the level of violent crime in their neighbourhood had increased, while slightly fewer (7%) believed that violent crime had decreased.

Business owners and managers in District 3 were significantly more likely to indicate that violent crime had decreased in their neighbourhood compared with all other Districts.

*Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.*
4.1.2.4 Property Crime in the Business Neighbourhood

Business owners and managers were more likely to indicate that the level of property crime had increased (18%) in their business’ neighbourhood than they were to say that violent crime had increased (8%).

Citywide, more than seven in ten business managers (72%) said that property crime in their neighbourhood had stayed about the same.

Far more business owners and managers in District 1 felt there had been an increase in property crime as opposed to a decrease in their neighbourhood, with those perceiving an increase rising from 15% in 2015 to 24% in 2016.

Conversely, business owners and managers in District 3 are more likely than those in other Districts to perceive a net decrease in property crime in their neighbourhood in 2016.

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.1.2.5 Most Important Crime-related Problem in the Business Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important Problem</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break &amp; enter, that is theft from property - break-in to a house or business</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs (non-spec)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft - from cars</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loitering/homelessness</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling/begging/squeegee people</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All participants (n=401).*

*Note: Responses mentioned by less than 2% of all participants not shown.*

Values circled are significantly different from the squared values in the same row at a 95% confidence interval.

Break & enter was the most frequently-mentioned crime-related problem at the neighbourhood level, mentioned by almost four in ten (38%) business owners and managers Citywide. This has consistently been the most important crime-related problem cited by business managers over the last four years.

Those in District 2 were less likely than those in other Districts to mention break & enter as the most important problem in their neighbourhood, although it was still their leading concern. Business owners and managers in District 4 were significantly less likely to mention drugs in general than those in other Districts.
4.2.2 PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN THE CITY

4.2.2.1 Violent Crime in the City

Business owners and managers were next asked about their perceptions of violent and property crime at the City level. These results are reported in the next two slides.

More than six in ten business managers (62%) indicated that violent crime levels stayed about the same Citywide in the 12 months prior to the survey, consistent with 61% in 2015. About one in ten (9%) said that violent crime had decreased Citywide in 2016. On the other hand, nearly three in ten (28%) thought that violent crime had increased in the City, a slight increase from the previous year.

The proportion of business managers Citywide who said that the levels of violent crime increased across the City was higher than the proportion who said there was a decrease within their neighbourhood. This gap was even more notable in 2016 than in 2015. Of note, those in District 4 were notably more likely to perceive an increase in violent crime Citywide (33%) than those in other Districts.

There continues to be a perceptual disconnect between what business people saw in their own neighbourhoods and what they believed was happening in the rest of the City.

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
The majority of business owners and managers (65%) thought that property crime had stayed about the same in the City overall, up slightly from 62% in 2015.

That said, the proportion of business managers who felt the level of property crime had increased in the 12 months prior to the survey has continued to increase since 2013 (from 17% to 25%).

Business managers in Districts 1 and 4 (28% and 27% respectively) were more likely to say property crime had increased Citywide in 2016.

Business managers were as likely to say property crime rates had decreased in both their own neighbourhoods and the City as a whole (both at 8%). On the other hand, business managers seemed more likely to say property crime had increased in the city (25%) compared with their own neighbourhoods (18%).

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.2.2.3 Most Important Crime-related Problem in the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important Problem</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs (non-spec)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break &amp; enter, that is theft from property - break-in to a house or business</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang activity</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence/violent crime</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults on individuals</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loitering/homelessness</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug dealing on the street/parks</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft -from cars</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic problems, such as speeding cars or cruising</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All participants (n=401).
Note:Responses mentioned by less than 2% of all participants not shown.
Values circled are significantly different from the squared values in the same row at a 95% confidence interval.

Drugs was the most frequently mentioned crime-related problem at the City level (30%) by business owners and managers. Break & enter/theft from property (18%) was also perceived as an important crime-related issue facing the City of Vancouver.

There was a significant increase in the number of business owners and managers mentioning drugs as a key crime-related problem in the City compared to the prior year (from 21% to 30%). On the other hand, the crime-related problems associated with gang activity continued to decrease since 2013 (from 20% to 9%).

Assaults on individuals was mentioned less frequently in District 3 than in Districts 2 or 4.
4.3 Experience with Crime
One-quarter (26%) of business managers Citywide said that a crime had occurred at their place of work in the 12 months prior to the survey, slightly higher than in 2015 when 22% experienced a crime at their workplace.

The rate of crime experienced in Districts 1 and 2 (32% each) was significantly higher than in District 4 (19%). The proportion of business managers in District 1 who said that a crime had occurred at their place has risen significantly over the past four years (from 19% in 2013 to 32% in 2016). Experience with crime decreased in District 3 from 27% in 2015 to 21% in 2016, although this decrease is not significant.
**4.3.1.2 Type of Crime**

Thinking about the last contact your business had with the Vancouver Police Department…

*Caution: District base sizes are small / very small and should be used for directional purposes only.*

Over one-half (55%) of business managers who had a crime occur at their business said the crime was against the business. About one-third (35%) reported that the crime was against a staff member. Almost eight in ten (78%) of these crimes were property crimes (as opposed to violent crimes).

Businesses in Districts 2 and 4 were more likely to have experienced crimes against the business than those in District 1 and District 3. Businesses in District 2 were the most likely to have experienced property crimes, though not significantly higher than the other Districts.

Note that base sizes for individual Districts are very small and should be interpreted with caution.

**Q12. Was the crime committed against...? (Citywide, 2016)**

- A staff member: 35%
- A business client/customer: 9%
- The business: 55%
- Don’t know/Refused: 1%

**Q13. Was it... (Citywide, 2016)**

- Violent crime: 1%
- Property crime: 21%
- Property crime: 78%
- DK/Refused: 1%

**District Analysis**

- **District 1**
  - Against staff: 44%
  - Against client: 12%
  - Against business: 22%
  - Violent crime: 6%
  - Property crime: 62%

- **District 2**
  - Against staff: 28%
  - Against client: 6%
  - Against business: 12%
  - Violent crime: 10%
  - Property crime: 88%

- **District 3**
  - Against staff: 43%
  - Against client: 48%
  - Against business: 29%
  - Violent crime: 21%
  - Property crime: 71%

- **District 4**
  - Against staff: 74%
  - Against client: 5%
  - Against business: 21%
  - Violent crime: 21%
  - Property crime: 74%

*Base: Business managers who experienced a crime against themselves, their staff or the business in the past 12 months; Total n=104 for 2016. Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.*

*Caution: District base sizes are small / very small and should be used for directional purposes only*
4.3.2 REPORTING THE CRIME

Q14. Was this crime reported to the police?

In addition to asking if they had experienced crime at their business, managers were asked if this crime had been reported. Overall, fewer than two-thirds (63%) of crimes were reported in 2016. There appears to be a trend of declining reporting of crimes among business managers since 2013, although this is not statistically significant.

There were no significant differences between Districts. That said, District 1 had the highest rate of reporting, with 69% of crimes being reported to the VPD. Districts 2 and 3 reflect the largest directional decline in reporting over the past four years.

Note that base sizes for individual Districts are very small and thus these results should be interpreted with caution.

As in previous years, the top reason given for not reporting crimes to police was the incident was not serious enough, followed by feeling that the police could not do anything about the crime.
4.4 **Community Participation**
4.4.1 PARTICIPATION IN A VPD-SPONSORED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE BUSINESS

Q16. In the past 12 months, have you, or anyone on your staff, participated in a program or received training for your business sponsored by the VPD?

Only 2% of business managers in 2016 said that they, or anyone on their staff, had participated in a program or received training sponsored by the VPD in the past 12 months, consistent with previous years. Participation rates are very similar across all the Districts in 2016.

The programs that participants were involved in include community awareness programs and community policing, although some also referred to other types of programs.
Businesses rated the importance of 12 different VPD programs and services. The programs perceived to be the most important (based on very and somewhat important combined ratings) were Victim Services (96%), DTES Foot Patrols (94%), Community Policing Centres (92%), and Block Watch (91%). The Granville Entertainment District Street Closures (69%) and the Beach Patrol (71%) were perceived to be the least important programs from business owners/managers' point of view.

The next page shows the perceptions of program importance by District.
### Importance of various VPD programs by Districts (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTES foot patrols</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Services</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Watch</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing centres</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Liaison Officers</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen's Crime Watch</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bait Car program</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Place</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Watch</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage 529</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Patrol</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville Street Closures</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- District 1: 99% 96% 95% 91% 91% 90% 89% 88% 88% 83% 81% 74% 73%
- District 2: 92% 91% 89% 88% 85% 85% 78% 66% 62%
- District 3: 91% 92% 91% 92% 90% 88% 88% 79% 71%
- District 4: 90% 87% 86% 85% 83% 81% 80% 71% 65%
Businesses’ ratings of the VPD’s performance on generating news stories informing the public on all topics (major arrests, crime reduction, drug crackdowns, and crime prevention) remained fairly consistent with 2015. The only significant difference was the improvement for generating news stories about crime reduction where the positive rating (scores of 4 or 5) increased from 44% in 2015 to 51% in 2016.

Consistent with 2015, Vancouver business owners and managers indicated that the VPD was best at generating news stories in 2016 about major arrests (66%), while the other three subject areas all rated between 50%-53% for positive ratings.
Q18. On a scale of 1 to 5, where five is excellent and one is poor, how would you rate the job of the VPD at generating news stories informing the public about...? (By District)

The District-level results for business ratings of the VPD’s performance on generating news stories informing the public on the topics of major arrests, crime reduction, drug crackdowns, and crime prevention tend to reflect those of the City overall.

Positive ratings for all four of these areas increased significantly for District 2 compared to the prior year. Overall, District 3 tended to have the most positive ratings on average across the four topics, followed by District 2.
4.4.4 SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE VPD

4.4.4.1 Sources of Information about the VPD in Past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media (such as Twitter, Instagram etc.)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vancouver Sun</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Province</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community newspaper</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Globe &amp; Mail</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood association newsletter</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Courier newspaper</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Westender newspaper</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All participants (n=401)
Note: List was read to participants, who could say “Yes” or “No” to each one.
Values circled are significantly different from the squared values in the same row at a 95% confidence interval.

Business managers were asked which of ten media sources they used in the previous 12 months for information regarding the VPD. Social media was cited as the top media source used for information about the VPD (50%). Of note, this option was added in 2016.

As in previous years, the top sources of information among traditional media sources were TV (46%), radio (40%), and the Vancouver Sun (36%). Popular secondary sources include the Province (30%), community newspapers (27%), and the Globe & Mail (26%).

There were many notable differences in information sources across the Districts. Business managers in District 1 were very likely to mention social media as the primary source used for information regarding the VPD, whereas social media was not as important among those in District 4. Meanwhile, radio was a greater source of information about the VPD in District 3 than in District 1.
4.4.4.2 Perceptions of How the Media Portrays the VPD

One-half (51%) of businesses Citywide had either a 'positive' or 'very positive' impression of the VPD based on their portrayal in local media. This is consistent with the perception in 2015.

There was a slight increase in positive perceptions of media coverage since 2015 in Districts 2 and 3, although this was not a significant change.

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.4.4.3 Use and satisfaction with the VPD website

Q21. Have you ever visited the Vancouver Police Department website?

Citywide, the VPD website was visited by over one-quarter (27%) of business managers, a notable but not significant increase from 2015.

Visitation to the VPD website was highest in Districts 1 and 3, although the differences by District were not statistically significant.

Among business owners and managers who visited the VPD website, two-thirds (67%) visited for general information. Almost one-half (46%) used the website for crime reporting purposes, while more than one-third either checked out current news on the public affairs page (36%) or searched for crime prevention tips (36%).

Businesses in District 1 were significantly more likely than those in District 3 to have used the website for crime reporting purposes.
Seven in ten (69%) of those business managers who visited the VPD website in 2016 evaluated it favourably. This represents a slight but not-significant decrease from 2015 (73%).

Significantly fewer business managers in District 2 rated their overall satisfaction with the website as ‘excellent’.
As in previous years, the most frequent suggestion that business managers gave for how the VPD could improve service was to increase the visibility and presence of the police in the neighbourhood (29%). This was followed by better communication/outreach to businesses (12%).

Increased visibility and police presence was mentioned significantly more by business managers in District 2 than those in District 4.

One-quarter (25%) of business managers did not have any suggestions for improving service in their neighbourhoods.
4.4.6 CONTACT WITH A NON-POLICE AGENCY

Q25. In the last 12 months has your business contacted an agency or public official, other than the police, to discuss a crime or nuisance problems, in the City of Vancouver?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency contacted</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gastown Patrol</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COV Health Department</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COV By-law Enforcement</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Security</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COV Engineering-Sanitation</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Business managers who contacted an agency in the last 12 months (n=27); interpret with caution due to very small sample size.
Note: Responses mentioned by less than 3% of participants are not shown.

In 2016, 7% of business owners and managers contacted an organization other than the police to discuss a crime or nuisance problem. This represents a small but not significant decrease from 2015 (11%).

The Gastown Patrol and COV Health Department were the most commonly contacted agencies.

There were no significant differences by District for contacting an organization other than the police to discuss a crime or nuisance problem.
4.5 Demographics—Business Profile
4.5.1 INDUSTRY

Q27. In what industry or field of business is your firm primarily involved? (Citywide, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Distribution/Retail</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Real Estate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Recreation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Utilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.5.2 BUSINESS SIZE

Q30. How many people does your business employ? (Citywide, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 23.4

District 1 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 31.5

District 2 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 20.5

District 3 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 17.7

District 4 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 18.9

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.5.3 HISTORY OF OPERATION

4.5.3.1 Number of Years Operating in the City

Q28. How long has your business been in operation in the City of Vancouver? (Citywide, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 10.3

District 1 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 9.9

District 2 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 10.2

District 3 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 10.7

District 4 (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 10.6

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
4.5.3.2 Number of Years Operating in the Neighbourhood

Q29. How long has your business been in operation in its current neighbourhood? (Citywide, 2016)

District 1 (2016)

- Up to one year: 1%
- 1-2 years: 8%
- 3-5 years: 13%
- 6-10 years: 27%
- Over 10 years: 47%

District 2 (2016)

- Up to one year: 2%
- 1-2 years: 8%
- 3-5 years: 14%
- 6-10 years: 12%
- Over 10 years: 62%

District 3 (2016)

- Up to one year: 4%
- 1-2 years: 5%
- 3-5 years: 14%
- 6-10 years: 15%
- Over 10 years: 59%

District 4 (2016)

- Up to one year: 2%
- 1-2 years: 7%
- 3-5 years: 9%
- 6-10 years: 17%
- Over 10 years: 64%

Note: Don’t know/Refused is not shown in the charts above.
SCREENING

1. Is your business located within the Vancouver City limits?
   - Yes .......................................................... 1 | CONTINUE
   - No ........................................................ 2 | THANK AND TERMINATE
   - Don't know .................................................. 97 | THANK AND TERMINATE

THANK AND TERMINATE FOR ALL given that we are conducting the survey on behalf of Vancouver City businesses, those will be all of your questions today. Thank you for your time.

RECORD GENDER

- Male
- Female

2. To determine which Vancouver Police District your business is located in, could I have the postal code of this business location?

RECORD POSTAL CODE. DETERMINE DISTRICT FROM LIST. IF PARTICIPANT REFUSES OR DOES NOT KNOW POSTAL CODE, USE POSTAL CODE FROM SAMPLE.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE VANCOUVER POLICE DEPARTMENT

The Vancouver Police Department is very interested in knowing what Vancouver businesses think about the services they provide to the City. Thinking about the Vancouver Police Department as a whole.....

8. a) Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by the Vancouver Police Department? Would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

   - Very dissatisfied ........................................ 1
   - Somewhat dissatisfied .................................. 2
   - Somewhat satisfied ..................................... 3
   - Very satisfied ........................................... 4
   - DON'T KNOW ........................................... 97  SKIP TO Q4
   - REFUSED .................................................. 98  SKIP TO Q4

   b) Can you explain why you feel this way? (ALL)

RECORD VERBATIM

4. Now, thinking ONLY of your OWN experience with the VPD, and NOT including anything else that you may have read, seen, or heard... can you please tell me how satisfied are you with the service provided...
by the Vancouver Police Department? Would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Very dissatisfied: 1
Somewhat dissatisfied: 2
Somewhat satisfied: 3
Very satisfied: 4

Have not had any contact/experience with the VPD: 56
DON'T KNOW: 97
REFUSED: 98

4. The following is a list of ways that the Vancouver Police Department serves the community. Using a scale of one to five where 5 is excellent – you are completely satisfied with how the police are doing in this area and 1 is poor – you are completely dissatisfied with how police are doing, how do you rate the Vancouver Police Department in terms of...

RANDOMIZE ARE BELOW

a. Responding to emergency situations
b. Meeting your business community's safety needs
c. Addressing street disorder

5. And do you think the police should spend more time addressing each of the following, or do you think they currently spend enough time addressing each of the following?

a. Theft from homes
b. Theft from businesses
c. Theft from vehicles
d. Theft of vehicles
e. Crime targeting seniors
f. Problem Drivers
g. Violent Crime
h. Drug Use
i. Gangs
j. Sexual crimes
k. Youth Violence
l. Hate crimes

1. Should spend more time addressing
2. Currently spend enough time addressing
97. DON'T KNOW
98. REFUSED

6. How well do the following qualities describe the Vancouver Police Department? Using a scale of one to five where 5 is excellent – you agree completely that this quality describes the Vancouver Police Department and 1 is poor – you completely disagree that this quality describes the Vancouver Police Department. (RANDOMIZE)

a. Fair
b. Professional
c. Knowledgeable
d. Trustworthy
e. Visible
f. Respectful
g. Accountable

This next section will ask some questions about any contact you have had with the Vancouver Police Department because of your business. This could include a conversation with a police officer in person or on the phone, a call to the police non-emergency number or any number of other ways that you may have been in contact with the Vancouver Police Department.

We are interested here in your contact with the members of the Vancouver Police Department – not contact with a 911 dispatcher or police from other jurisdictions.

7. During the past 12 months, has your business had contact with the Vancouver Police Department?

YES: 1
NO: 2
DON'T KNOW: 97
REFUSED: 98

CONTINUE

GO TO PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY
GO TO PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY

8. a) Overall, how satisfied were you with the service your business received from the Vancouver Police Department? Would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

Very dissatisfied: 1
Somewhat dissatisfied: 2
Somewhat satisfied: 3
Very satisfied: 4

DON'T KNOW: 97
REFUSED: 98

b) Can you explain why you feel this way? (ALL)

RECORD VERBATIM

5. Thinking of your most recent contact with the Vancouver Police Department, can you tell me what type of contact it was?

RECORD VERBATIM
### PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY

Now, I have some questions about the neighbourhood in which your business is located.

10. a) Now we would like your impression of how safe you feel your business' neighbourhood is compared to other neighbourhoods in the city. Using a scale of one to five, where a '1' means you feel your neighbourhood is one of the most dangerous in the city and a '5' means that you feel your neighbourhood is one of the safest in the city, how safe do you feel your neighbourhood is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dangerously</th>
<th>Most Dangerous</th>
<th>One of the safest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) [ASK ONLY IF OR>50] Can you tell me the primary reason you feel this way?

**RECORD VERBATIM**

Thinking about your neighbourhood......

11. a) In the past 12 months, would you say the level of violent crime in your business' neighbourhood has:

If necessary, provide definition of violent crime: offences that deal with the application, or threat of application, of force to a person. These include homicide, attempted murder, various forms of sexual and non-sexual assault, robbery and abduction. Traffic incidents that result in death or bodily harm are included under Criminal Code traffic incidents.

| Increased significantly | 1 |
| Increased somewhat       | 2 |
| Stayed about the same    | 3 |
| Decreased somewhat       | 4 |
| Decreased significantly   | 5 |

**DO NOT READ: DON'T KNOW OR HAS NOT OPERATED IN NEIGHBOURHOOD**

Long enough to form opinion...........97

Refused..................................98

b) In the past 12 months, would you say the level of property crime in your business' neighbourhood has: (READ LIST IN ORDER)

If necessary, provide definition of property crime: unlawful acts with the intent of gaining property but do not involve the use or threat of violence against an individual. Theft, breaking and entering, fraud and possession of stolen goods are examples of property crimes.

| Increased significantly | 1 |
| Increased somewhat       | 2 |
| Stayed about the same    | 3 |
| Decreased somewhat       | 4 |
| Decreased significantly   | 5 |

**DO NOT READ: DON'T KNOW OR HAS NOT OPERATED IN NEIGHBOURHOOD**

Long enough to form opinion...........97

Refused..................................98

b) In the past 12 months, would you say the level of property crime in the city of Vancouver has: (READ LIST IN ORDER)

If necessary, provide definition of property crime:

| Increased significantly | 1 |
| Increased somewhat       | 2 |
| Stayed about the same    | 3 |
| Decreased somewhat       | 4 |
| Decreased significantly   | 5 |

**DO NOT READ: DON'T KNOW OR HAS NOT OPERATED IN NEIGHBOURHOOD**

Long enough to form opinion...........97

Refused..................................98
c) What do you think is the most important crime-related problem in the city of Vancouver? DO NOT READ LIST. RECORD ONE RESPONSE.

RECORD VERBATIM

UNREPORTED CRIME

Thinking of your business experiences with crime.....

13. In the past 12 months, have you, or any of your employees been a victim of a crime while at work (for example, vandalism, theft, or physical assault) in the city of Vancouver?

YES………………………………………1  CONTINUE
NO………………………………………2  GO TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
DON’T KNOW …………………………97  GO TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
REFUSED……………………………98  GO TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

14. Now thinking only about the last contact your business had with the Vancouver Police Department: was the crime...

a. Committed against the business 01
b. Committed against a staff member at the business 02
c. Committed against a client/customer of the business 03
d. DON’T KNOW 97
e. REFUSED 98

15. Was it a property crime or violent crime? [IF NECESSARY, PROVIDE DEFINITION OF VIOLENT AND PROPERTY CRIME]

a. Property 01
b. Violent 02
c. DON’T KNOW 97
d. REFUSED 98

16. Still thinking only about the last contact your business had with the Vancouver Police Department, was this crime reported to the police?

YES………………………………………1  GO TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
NO……………………………………….2  CONTINUE
DON’T KNOW …………………………97  GO TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
REFUSED……………………………98  GO TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

17. Why did you or your employee(s) decide not to report this crime to the police?

RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE AS NECESSARY.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The Vancouver Police Department runs various training programs for the community to increase safety in Vancouver.

10. a) In the past 12 months, have you, or anyone on your staff, participated in a program or received training for your business that was sponsored by the Vancouver Police Department?

YES………………………………………1  CONTINUE
NO……………………………………….2  GO TO Q19
DON’T KNOW …………………………97  GO TO Q19
REFUSED……………………………98  GO TO Q19

b) Which ones? (DO NOT READ LIST – INCLUDE ALL RESPONSES)

1. FALSE ALARM REDUCTION PROGRAM
2. BLOCK WATCH PROGRAM
3. HASTINGS SUNRISE PROGRAM
4. COMMUNITY POLICING
5. BUSINESS LICENSING (COMMERCIAL CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM)
6. COMMUNITY AWARENESS PROGRAM (NON-SPEC)
91. POLICE PRESENTATIONS (NON-SPEC)
55. OTHER (SPECIFY)
59. DON’T KNOW

19. While you may not have direct experience with the following programs, please indicate how important each is to you as a business owner or manager in Vancouver? If you have not heard of one of these initiatives before, just tell me. Would you say the program is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not important at all?

01………………………………………VERY IMPORTANT
02…………………………………… SOMewhat IMPORTANT
08…………………………………… NOT VERY IMPORTANT
04…………………………………… NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL
06…………………………………… HAVE NOT HEARD OF THIS
96…………………………………… DON’T KNOW
97…………………………………… REFUSED

a. Community Policing Centres
b. Downtown Eastside foot patrols
c. Bike Patrol Program
d. Granville Entertainment District Street Closures
a. Beach Patrol
f. Block Watch
g. Citizen’s Crime Watch
h. School Liaison Officers
i. Victim Services
j. Sister Watch
k. Safe Place
i) Garage 425 (Bicycle anti-theft program)

20. On a scale of 1 to 5, where five is excellent and one is poor, how would you rate the job of the Vancouver Police Department at generating news stories informing the public about:

   a. Major arrests?  
      1 2 3 4 5 97 96
   b. Crime reduction projects?  
      1 2 3 4 5 97 96
   c. Drug crackdowns?  
      1 2 3 4 5 97 96
   d. Crime prevention programs?  
      1 2 3 4 5 97 96

21. From which of these sources has your business received information about the Vancouver Police Department in the last 12 months? READ LIST. RECORD MULTIPLE. YES/NO FOR EACH ITEM. INCLUDE DK, REF AS OPTION FOR EACH ITEM:

   TV ................................................. 01
   Radio ............................................. 02
   The Vancouver Sun ................................ 03
   The Province ..................................... 04
   The Globe and Mail ................................ 05
   The Courier Newspaper ........................... 06
   The Westender Newspaper ......................... 07
   Community Newspaper ............................ 08
   Neighbourhood Association newsletter ........... 09
   Social Media (such as Twitter, Instagram, and so on) 10

22. Overall, what impression do you have of the Vancouver Police Department based on local media coverage? Would you say it is:

   Varies positive ......................... 01
   Positive ................................ 02
   Somewhat positive .......... 03
   Not at all positive ........... 04

23. Have you ever visited the Vancouver Police Department website?

   YES ........................................ 01
   NO ................................... 02
   REFUSE 99

24. When visiting the website, do you visit for:

   a) General information about the Vancouver Police Department?
      YES ........................................ 01
      NO ................................... 02
      REFUSE 99

   b) Career information?
      YES ........................................ 01
      NO ................................... 02
      REFUSE 99

25. On a scale of 1 to 5, where five is high and one is low, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the website?

   1 2 3 4 5 .................................. DON'T KNOW REFUSE 97 98

26. If you could make one recommendation to the Vancouver Police Department about how they could improve services to your neighborhood, what would it be?

   RECORD VERBATIM

27. In the last 12 months has your business contacted an agency or public official, other than the police, to discuss a crime or nuisance problem, in the City of Vancouver?

   [FORMERLY Q21A]

   Yes..................................................... 1
   No.................................................... 2
   CONTINUE
   GO TO DEMOGRAPHICS
28. Which other agencies, other than the police, has your business been in contact with to discuss a crime or nuisance problem in the last 12 months?

DO NOT READ. RECORD MULTIPLES.

1. COV Animal Control (COV = City of Vancouver)
2. COV Buildings Inspections/Permits
3. COV Parks and Recreation
4. B.C. Transit/TransLink
5. Ministry of Social Services
6. COV Health Department
7. COV Department of Motor Vehicle
8. COV Housing
9. Neighbourhood Associations
10. R.C.M.P.
11. COV By-law Enforcement
12. COV Fire Department
13. COV Engineering-Water Works
14. COV Engineering-Sanitation
15. COV Officials, non-police
16. COV Graffiti Reports
17. City Hall/Council
18. MLA
19. Other
20. Don’t know
21. None

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

29. In what industry or field of business is your firm primarily involved? READ LIST IF NECESSARY. IF SELF-EMPLOYED, PROBE WITH: In what industry or field of business would that be? (a)

Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining: 02
Business Services: 02
Communications/Utilities: 02
Construction/Real Estate: 04
Educational: 05
Entertainment/Recreation: 06
Health Services: 07
Finance/Insurance: 08

Hospitality (e.g., hotels, motels, restaurants, tourism): 09
Information Technology: 10
Legal: 11
Manufacturing: 12
Non-profit: 13
Personal Services: 14
Research and Development: 15
Social Services: 16
Transportation (truck, ship, rail, air): 17
Wholesale/Distribution/Retail: 13
Other, SPECIFY: 95
Don’t Know: 97

30. How long has your business been in operation in the city of Vancouver?

Up to one year: 1
1-2 years: 2
3-5 years: 3
6-10 years: 4
Over 10 years: 5
Don’t know: 97
Refused: 98

31. How long has your business been in operation in its current neighbourhood?

Up to one year: 1
1-2 years: 2
3-5 years: 3
6-10 years: 4
Over 10 years: 5
Don’t know: 97
Refused: 98

32. How many people does your business employ? (full-time equivalents at your location)

0-25: 1
26-50: 2
51-100: 3
101-250: 4
251-500: 5
Over 500: 6
Don’t know: 97
Refused: 98

33. What is the name of the business association that represents your neighborhood’s business community? (DO NOT READ LIST)

If Don’t know, Record “DK”

1. Chinese Business Association
2. COLLINGWOOD BA
3. COMMERCIAL DRIVE BA
4. DOWNTOWN BIA/BA
5. DUNBAR BA
6. GASTOWN BIA
7. KITSILANO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
8. MOUNT PLEASANT BIA
9. YALETOWN BIA
10. KITSILANO BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
11. MOUNT PLEASANT BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
12. SOUTH GRANVILLE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
13. STRATHCONA BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT
14. GRANVILLE ISLAND BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
15. CHINESE BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS
16. OTHER NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATIONS
17. OTHER HOSPITALITY ASSOCIATIONS
18. OTHER COMPANY NAMES
19. BC BAR ASSOCIATION
20. BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU
21. DUNBAR BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
22. FRASER STREET BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
23. HAIRDRESSERS ASSOCIATION
24. KERRISDALE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
25. PUNJABI MARKET
26. UPTOWN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
27. YALETOWN MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION
28. CHURCH/ NON-PROFIT ASSOCIATION
29. BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION (NEC)
30. MEDICAL/ HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION
31. MEDICAL/ HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION
32. VANCOUVER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
33. BIA- BUSINESS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
34. OTHER
35. N/A

34. So that my supervisor can check my work, may I have your first name or initial?

RECORD

Thank you very much for participating in this survey. Your responses will be combined with those of other
Vancouver businesses and will provide valuable input to the Vancouver Police Department.