TO:  
Vancouver Police Board Service and Policy Complaint Review Committee

FROM:  
Drazen Manojlovic, Director, Planning, Research, and Audit Section

SUBJECT:  
Service or Policy Complaint (#2018-133) on Street Checks

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Vancouver Police Board Service and Policy Complaint Review Committee instruct the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) to implement the six recommendations detailed in the attached report titled **Understanding Street Checks**, to ensure that street checks are used in a transparent and accountable manner that balances the need to maximize public safety while respecting the experiences, and addressing the concerns, of the communities that the VPD serves.

BACKGROUND:
In May 2018, the VPD publicly released data on street checks. The data included the annual number of street checks conducted over the ten-year period from 2008-2017, and provided data regarding the ethnicity and gender of persons that were checked by front-line VPD officers. In June 2018, the Union of BC Indian Chiefs and the BC Civil Liberties Association submitted a Service or Policy Complaint to the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner. The complainants stated, “in 2017, Indigenous people accounted for over 16 percent of the checks despite making up just over two percent of the population”, and “in 2017, Black people accounted for five percent of the checks despite making up only one percent of the population.” Based on these figures, the complainants concluded that street checks were “being conducted in a discriminatory manner” and that the street check data is “statistical evidence of discrimination.” An amended complaint, submitted in July 2018, similarly questioned the statistical overrepresentation of Indigenous females in VPD street check data, stating, “in 2016, Indigenous women accounted for over one-fifth of all checks of women (21%).”

DISCUSSION:
Accompanying this report is a comprehensive review of street checks. This review provides:

- Context and background on what a street check is;
- The circumstances under which street checks are conducted and the legal authorities for these checks;
- A statistical analysis of the frequency, location and background of persons that were checked by VPD officers;
• A discussion of what steps the VPD has taken to ensure street checks are not conducted in a random or arbitrary manner; and,
• An examination of the ongoing training that the VPD has conducted to educate its members about Indigenous Peoples and Black persons and the challenges they face.

**General Findings:**
The review’s statistical analysis shows that the vast majority of street checks (80% of those conducted in 2017) involved persons that were already associated to crime by Metro Vancouver police agencies and who, on average, had been the subject of 22 previous criminal investigations prior to VPD officers conducting a street check of the individual.

The police have a legal obligation to preserve the peace, prevent crime, and keep citizens safe. This obligation, and the corollary police authority, are based on the public’s expectation that police officers will proactively interact with persons who are exhibiting behaviour that is indicative of criminal activity. Examples of such behaviour include a known sex offender loitering in an area that children frequent, a person shining a flashlight into cars in a parking lot where there have been high rates of thefts from vehicles, and a person found in a secluded building alcove of a closed business late at night. In assessing such situations, a person’s race or gender does not form any basis to support an officer’s decision to conduct a street check.

In addition to preventing crime, the police are required to be responsive to calls for service from the public. This review found that street checks also result from calls for service from the public when citizens call to report concerns about something that they have observed, as opposed to solely being initiated by police officers based on observations of suspected criminal or suspicious behaviour.

Police officers are also required to take action that prevents harm to any individual. This duty is even more vital to fulfil when it pertains to potentially vulnerable persons including those dealing with mental health challenges, addiction issues or homelessness. As such, police officers also utilize street checks to ensure the well-being of individuals in the community. In respect of the issue of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls, VPD officers have utilized street checks to check on the well-being of Indigenous females. In the ten years from 2008-2017, there were a total of 3,988 street checks of Indigenous females; it was found that the majority of these street checks (53%) involved Indigenous females who were the subject of a missing person report. The documented street check information – including locations where the at-risk female may frequent, friends or associates that she was with who may have a means of contacting or later locating the female – provide valuable information that can be used by police if the woman goes missing. It is important to note that in such circumstances, the police interaction with the female and the information recorded is used to ensure that public safety is maximized for all persons and especially for vulnerable segments of the community.

A geographic analysis of street checks was also conducted for the attached report. This analysis determined that street checks occurred most frequently in areas of Vancouver where the violent crime rate was highest – an indication that these checks are being used as a proactive response to prevent violence in these high crime areas. This geographic analysis also found that street checks are strongly correlated to areas where the VPD receives the highest concentration of calls for service from the public – indicative of street checks being conducted to address neighbourhood and community crime issues. Collectively, these findings indicate that street checks are not being conducted in an arbitrary manner. Rather, street checks are being conducted of persons already associated to crime that have extensive prior dealings with police and occur in locations where the violent crime rate is highest and where the community makes the greatest number of requests for police service.
Representation of Genders and Ethnicities:
The VPD remains wholly transparent around its use of street check and the data that is captured in an effort to prevent crime and ensure public safety. The conclusion advanced by the complainants that street check data is evidence of police discrimination oversimplifies the complex societal factors and historical context of our community.

While the VPD strives for the equal and equitable treatment of all persons under the law, we acknowledge that historical factors have influenced the environment in which we police. We respect and continually strive to better understand the troubling Canadian history of systemic discrimination against Indigenous Peoples. The impact that this history has on our society was highlighted in the seminal 1999 Supreme Court of Canada ruling in *R. v. Gladue*, regarding the sentencing of an Indigenous woman from British Columbia, that discussed how the particular circumstances that brought an Indigenous Person before the court must be carefully considered:

*Years of dislocation and economic development have translated, for many aboriginal peoples, into low incomes, high unemployment, lack of opportunities and options, lack or irrelevance of education, substance abuse, loneliness, and community fragmentation. These and other factors contribute to a higher incidence of crime and incarceration.*

The generational effects of colonization, displacement, discriminatory government policies and the residential school system have disadvantaged Indigenous Peoples. We recognize that this discrimination has led to overrepresentation of Indigenous Peoples in all aspects of the criminal justice system.

Locally, the VPD appreciates that in 2017, 39 percent of homeless persons in Metro Vancouver were Indigenous Peoples, despite comprising just 2.5% of the population. This rate of homelessness was nearly two and a half times the percentage of Indigenous Peoples that were street checked in 2017 (16%). The conclusion that the overrepresentation of Indigenous Peoples in street check data is evidence of discrimination fails to control for complex societal factors and the generations of mistreatment of Indigenous Peoples.

In addition to controlling for societal factors, attempts to draw conclusions from VPD street check data must also control for the rate of criminal charges laid by Crown counsel and the rate of imprisonment following conviction by the courts. Both of these bodies, Crown counsel and the courts, serve as important independent entities that respectively review and try facts collected by the police. The attached review of street checks found that there was a strong relationship between street checks and criminal charges. The analysis showed that the percentage of street checks by ethnicity is comparable to the percentages of criminal charges. For example, the complainants note street checks of Black persons was 5% in 2017. However, the review of VPD data found that in the ten-year period from 2008-2017, 4.7% of violent crime offenders were Black persons – a result which supports the conclusion that the rate of street checks is highly correlated to the rate at which offenders are charged. This outcome is not an indictment of any community or group; rather, it indicates that overrepresentation of specific communities or groups is likely primarily driven by complex socio-economic factors.

Similar to criminal charges, the ethnicity and gender of incarcerated persons does not align with population data. In Canada, Indigenous Peoples comprise 5% of the population; however, in 2016-17, Indigenous Peoples represented 28 percent of the adults admitted to provincial or territorial correctional facilities and, similarly, 27 percent of the adults admitted to federal facilities. In British Columbia, Indigenous Peoples comprised 30 percent of the men admitted to correctional
facilities, while Indigenous women comprised nearly half (47%) of all women admitted – highlighting the need to be especially cognizant of the challenges faced by Indigenous women.

It is unrealistic and overly simplistic to expect racial and gender population statistics to align uniformly with crime data. For example, women make up about half of the population and men make up the other half. However, men commit approximately 80 percent of crime. In addition, the overrepresentation of specific groups within street check data is not unique to visible minority communities, as the majority of street checks involved Caucasians: in 2016, Caucasian people made up 46 percent of the Vancouver population and were overrepresented in the street check data, as they comprised 57 percent of total street checks conducted by the VPD.

The front-line police work performed by VPD officers to ensure public safety, including street checks, is not discriminatory. The VPD does not condone police officers carrying out arbitrary or random stops that are unlawful or do not have a valid policing purpose. A person’s gender or ethnicity are not grounds that can be used to justify police action. Furthermore, the VPD adheres to, and reinforces, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the BC Human Rights Code in order to guard against arbitrary detention and any other potentially discriminatory practice.

MOVING FORWARD:
While there is no statistical basis for the conclusion that the actions of VPD officers are systematically discriminatory, the VPD respects that the analysis of street check data over the past ten years is limited in its ability to capture the unique concerns and experiences of the communities that the VPD serves. While not being motivated by ethnicity or gender, the VPD appreciates that persons being checked can sometimes perceive that these factors may be at play, especially in instances where the person has limited previous interactions with the police. This potential and the experiences of the diverse communities that comprise Vancouver are critical for the VPD to further understand and appreciate. The public’s trust in the professionalism and impartiality of the VPD is critical to ensuring public safety in Vancouver.

The VPD is committed to transparency in its actions and remaining accountable in its service to the public. The VPD respects that its success is inherently reliant upon maintaining and improving on its existing relationships with the communities it serves. Unquestionably, the public must have complete confidence that the VPD’s practices, including its use of street checks, are not discriminatory. To ensure this, the attached report recommends:

- Formalizing our existing VPD street check standards into policy and ensuring that our policy adheres to new provincial standards that are currently being developed;
- Additional training to ensure that VPD officers are utilizing street checks appropriately;
- Committing to publicly releasing VPD street check data annually;
- Furthering existing community relationships to better understand the unique experiences, perceptions and histories of the communities that we serve;
- Assigning an Indigenous Liaison Protocol Officer to support greater communication between our patrol officers and our partners in the Indigenous community; and,
- Establishing a new street check category in the records system to specifically document when officers are dealing with an individual to ensure their safety and well-being.
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September 2018
Message from Chief Constable Adam Palmer

As Chief Constable of the Vancouver Police Department, my most important responsibility is to ensure that our communities are safe. I also have an obligation to safeguard the public’s confidence in the police. I commissioned a full review into how the Vancouver Police Department conducts street checks in response to a complaint received by the Vancouver Police Board.

Sadly, we have a troubling history in Canada of systemic discrimination against Indigenous Peoples – this has been extensively researched and documented. The generational effects of colonization, displacement, the residential school system and discriminatory government policies have disadvantaged and impoverished Indigenous Peoples. We recognize that this discrimination has led to substance use, poverty, homelessness and over-representation of Indigenous people in the criminal justice system. As a society, we failed Indigenous People, and as Chief, I feel strongly that we all have a responsibility to ensure that systemic racism and discriminatory practices do not happen, ever.

This history has relevance in all aspects of the criminal justice system, not just policing. That is why it is critical that we continue to train and educate our officers to ensure that they understand and respect the history and culture of Indigenous Peoples. At the same time, we must continue to build and strengthen partnerships with Vancouver’s Indigenous communities to learn from their personal experiences and to implement proactive crime prevention initiatives that protect everyone.

Street checks are a very small component of the proactive policing work we do: the numbers average out to one street check, per officer, per month. Although the Vancouver Police Department uses them infrequently, street checks are an effective tool in keeping the city safe. Here is what the analysis of our street check data shows us:

- The overwhelming majority of street checks are of persons previously involved in crime;
- Street checks occur in areas where violent crime is most prevalent;
- Street checks can be a result of a call for service from the public and street checks occur most in areas where we have high concentrations of calls for service from the public; and,
- Street checks are also used to check on the well-being of vulnerable individuals, such as those who are struggling with mental health, addiction issues, or homelessness.

I recognize that the relationship between the police and the communities they serve can be complex. In Vancouver, I am very proud to lead a progressive police department, made up of diverse, open-minded people. However, I fully understand that our success in keeping Vancouver safe, hinges on maintaining the trust and support of all our communities. To ensure that we remain transparent and accountable to the communities we serve, we are implementing the following changes moving forward:

- Formalizing our existing VPD street check standards into policy and ensuring that our policy adheres to new provincial standards that are currently being developed;
- Additional training to ensure that VPD officers are utilizing street checks appropriately;
• Committing to publicly releasing VPD street check data annually;
• Furthering existing community relationships to better understand the unique experiences, perceptions and histories of the communities that we serve;
• Assigning a special liaison officer to support greater communication between our patrol officers and our partners in the Indigenous community; and,
• Improving data collection by establishing a street check category in the records system to specifically document when officers are dealing with an individual to ensure their safety and well-being.

I hope this comprehensive review will provide clarity about the use of street checks by the Vancouver Police Department and their role in ensuring the safety of our community.
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Note on Language Use

The Vancouver Police Department acknowledges that there exists differing opinions on the appropriate use of terminology. For the purposes of this document, and in observance of the Federal Government’s recognition of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis as Indigenous Peoples, we refer to these populations as Indigenous; this is also consistent with standard terminology used in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The term Aboriginal is used when referencing existing organizations or material.
Executive Summary

Upon the release of data on street checks, on June 14, 2018, the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) received notification of a complaint filed with the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner (OPCC) by the Union of BC Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) and the BC Civil Liberties Association (BCCLA). The complaint states that, based on the release, the “data create [sic] a strong suggestion that street checks are being conducted in a discriminatory manner.” This conclusion of discrimination is based on their position that the statistical proportion of ethnicities that are street checked, do not match their statistical proportion in the population of Vancouver. Specifically, Indigenous Peoples make up approximately 2% of Vancouver's population and they represented 16% of street checks in 2017. Likewise, 5% of 2017 street checks were of Black persons; however, Black persons comprise 1% of Vancouver's population. While not specified in the complaint, Caucasians were also statistically overrepresented in the street check data; while comprising 46% of Vancouver's population, Caucasians made up 57% of those that were street checked in 2017.

The complaints also questioned the need and effectiveness of street checks as a policing tool. An addendum to this complaint, received on July 12, 2018, requested an investigation into the overrepresentation of Indigenous women. Specifically, “Indigenous women accounted for over one-fifth of all checks of women (21%), despite making up only two percent of the population of women in the city – overrepresentation by a factor of nine.”

In response to this complaint, the VPD conducted a comprehensive statistical review of street checks in Vancouver. Part of this review includes important background and context, which appropriately frames this multi-faceted discussion. Amongst others, this context refers to themes such as the VPD’s efforts focused on engaging Vancouver’s Indigenous Peoples, along with a discussion on the negative effects of racial profiling. The review then proceeds to examine how street checks are utilized in Vancouver, outlines their function as a valuable proactive policing practice, and presents analyses on who VPD officers street check, and the locations of these street checks.

The empirical findings of this review suggest that the statistical overrepresentation of certain ethnic groups in street checks is not based on arbitrary discriminatory police practices. Rather, it may be related or symptomatic of broader socioeconomic disadvantages. For example, Indigenous statistical overrepresentation in the criminal justice system has been widely acknowledged and linked to historical factors that include poverty, history of abuse, and the intergenerational scars of Residential Schools. Moreover, for example, within Metro Vancouver in 2017, Indigenous Peoples accounted for 34% of the entire homeless population. There would be a strong likelihood that all of these societal issues and risk factors affect police interactions with citizens.

An examination of VPD’s data on street checks supports the view that VPD officers conduct street checks in a non-random manner. Rather, street checks generally occur when a police officer views unusual, suspicious, or potentially criminal behaviour. In addition, street checks are also commonly used to check on the well-being of citizens, or in response to calls for assistance from the public. Overall, street checks are an integral component of a community safety strategy.
SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS:

Street Checks Target Repeat Offenders
Research shows that repeat offenders commit a considerable amount of crime. It is a preventative policing and VPD strategy to engage repeat offenders if they are seen in areas where crimes are frequently reported. This is done with the widely accepted theory that police presence and a conversation with a police officer deters crime. Criminologists, crime analysts, and police leaders acknowledge the benefits of engaging repeat offenders as a strategy to decrease crime. ²

• The 2017 analysis showed that the VPD conducts the majority (80%) of street checks on individuals who have been suspects in an average of 22 separate criminal investigations by police departments in Metro Vancouver (they were suspects before the street check). Of these:
  o 89% of Indigenous Peoples that were street checked in 2017 were identified as suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 29 separate criminal investigations per person);
  o 84% of Caucasians that were street checked in 2017 were identified as suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 23 separate criminal investigations per person); and
  o 83% of Black persons that were street checked in 2017 were identified as suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 26 separate criminal investigations per person).

Street Checks Occur in High Crime Areas
An important facet in the detection and prevention of delinquency is that crime is often concentrated in clusters of areas, often referred to as ‘hotspots’. As a result, the VPD’s crime prevention work is developed around problem areas, and the use of street checks is a tool to support these prevention efforts and to keep Vancouver a safe place.

• The analyses illustrated that the area where street checks were conducted by VPD officers is highly co-related to the areas where the VPD received the most calls for assistance from public; and
• The data also showed that street checks conducted by VPD officers were in the areas with the most violent crime (e.g., sexual assaults, robberies, and attempted murders).

Street Checks are Used to Ensure the Well-Being of At-Risk Citizens
To further the fundamental principle of ensuring safety, police officers play an important role in ensuring the well-being of citizens, which in many cases involves those members of the community that are most vulnerable. For example, VPD officers conduct well-being checks of homeless individuals during the winter months, when temperatures drop below freezing and vulnerable members of the community are at risk for exposure to the elements. VPD officers also regularly work to provide assistance with finding available accommodations for those sleeping out on the street.
• Of all street checks that the VPD conducted from 2008-2017, it is estimated that 23% were of individuals that were homeless (or had no fixed address).

The link between well-being street checks and positive outcomes for missing person’s cases also exists. For example, street checks regularly assist in locating missing persons.

• Over a 10-year period, there were 3,988 street checks of Indigenous females. Of these women, 53% had been the subject of a missing persons report.

As outlined in the findings, street checks are policing strategies to mitigate crime or used to check on the well-being of citizens. The VPD is committed to ensuring that citizen rights are respected, and accordingly does not stop, question, or detain citizens for a reason based on prohibited grounds of discrimination, or engage in racial profiling. The VPD is also committed to ensuring staff are trained on the appropriate use of street checks, as well as continued training on working with diverse communities. The Fair and Impartial Policing training objectives and its exposure to our members to persons with lived experience will continue to reinforce the principles of impartiality and equity to our officers. Community engagement with Vancouver’s culturally diverse communities continues to be a priority and is reflected in the VPD’s countless community engagement initiatives.
What are Street Checks and how do they Improve Public Safety?

Communication with citizens in a variety of circumstances is a vital aspect to a police officer performing their duties. Police have hundreds of thousands of interactions with the public each year. These interactions form an integral aspect of a police officer’s role in pursuing public safety. The value of communication between the police and the public is an integral component to public safety. The VPD considers a street check as a type of interaction arising from non-random contact between members of the public and the police. Street checks typically occur when a police officer views suspicious or potentially criminal behaviour by a person or persons. Also, and of note, street checks are not necessarily negative in nature, as many street checks are done to ensure the well-being and safety of citizens.

A Component of Proactive Policing

The role of police officers in Canada has undergone significant reform in the past 20 years. The duties performed by police have expanded beyond traditional crime prevention and law enforcement to include a role more akin to that of a social worker, mental health professional, and community outreach worker. For example, a 2017 study by the VPD found that approximately 34% of calls for service (CFS) involved responding to crime. The other two-thirds of CFS that VPD officers attended were comprised of public safety calls (e.g., missing persons, well-being checks) and disorder calls (e.g., disturbances, fights). Police attendance at these disorder-related calls have a moderating effect on criminal activity and often prevent further crimes from occurring. As the first resource to be called whenever an issue develops within the community, police officers must now manage competing, and at times, challenging demands for assistance that span a range of services far removed from crime prevention. It is from this lens that one should consider how VPD officers work, which also includes a duty to detect and prevent crime.

Preventing and monitoring crime in Vancouver is a key responsibility for the VPD. The VPD works to detect and prevent crime through several proactive strategies. Proactive work is an important aspect of policing and refers to work that officers engage in when they are not actively responding to citizen calls for assistance. VPD officers use information from crime analysts towards evidence-led approaches to identify crime problems. This is accomplished through the collection and analyses of data, to develop a critical and objective understanding of crime in Vancouver. Police experts and criminologists agree that “rather than just focusing on the incidents of crime, police need to consistently examine their data to better understand what exactly is the problem or problems that are contributing to crime or disorder in their communities and use this information to develop strategies to respond to and prevent the problem(s).”

Based on the analysis of evolving and emerging crime issues within the community, the VPD in turn, uses that information to help determine the best use of limited police resources. Police deployment and special attention to a particular area, is premised on an evidence-based decision-making approach, where officers are guided by detailed analysis of developing issues, with the intent of preventing the escalation and furtherance of a crime issue. For example, crime analysis may identify an emerging crime series, in that a chronic offender is targeting a particular neighbourhood where they are active on specific days of the week and/or at particular times. The VPD may respond by deploying specialty units to identify and
apprehend the individual based on the recommendations of the analysis. This is a cornerstone of evidence-based policing, where data analysis helps to make more efficient and effective use of police resources. As a result, the deployment of police to a particular neighbourhood is not random and arbitrary, but rather, premised on addressing an emerging crime and street disorder issue and the best use of police resources to ensure community safety.

_Police should, as a matter of routine, consistently use data to understand historical and contemporary crime trends, understand what drives their specific crime trends, and understand the ‘rhythms’ of crime in their jurisdictions. In other words, data analysis provides police with a wealth of information about crime and its predictable patterns in a jurisdiction...^4_

**The utility of street checks** in proactive crime-prevention strategies has been documented by criminologists. For example, in their description of essential crime reduction principles, Cohen, Plecas, McCormick & Peters (2014) outline that deliberate street checks can effectively contribute towards relevant investigative information and developing crime trends. Street checks can show relationships between individuals, vehicles and places at a particular time. That is, “street checks...provide police with useful information about relationships between potential suspects that, when combined with technologies for network analysis, have the potential to uncover complex relationship between criminal networks.”^5 This information, in turn, often provides valuable data to police in future investigations. For example, street checks are a particularly valuable method for monitoring and informing crime prevention strategies to address chronic offenders.

**Street checks are Used when Responding to Citizens**

Towards the goal of serving the community, a primary function of the VPD is to respond to citizen requests for police assistance, or CFS. A CFS is initiated whenever the public calls either the police non-emergency number, calls 911, or sees a police officer and asks for assistance (e.g., flags down a police vehicle). Depending on the nature of the call, a police officer is often dispatched to investigate further. VPD officers respond to these community calls for assistance for countless situations. For example, in 2017, the VPD received 267,937 CFS, which on average, is a CFS every 1 minute and 58 seconds (or 734 calls per day).

Citizen-initiated calls may lead to a street check, as the attending officer conducts an investigation to determine whether an offence has been committed and the persons responsible. Consequently, some street checks are not necessarily police-initiated. For example, it is common for citizens to call the VPD if they see an individual engaged in suspicious activity. For example, the VPD commonly receives calls from citizens when they see a suspicious individual peering through car windows with a flashlight. In this circumstance, a crime may not have yet been committed, nonetheless, the VPD has a duty to prevent crime, and would be legally justified in speaking to the suspect matching the description reported by the citizen, and determine their identity. The street check may document the suspicious behaviours, clothing descriptions, time of day, among other factors.
Indeed, calls from citizens regarding suspicious activity are frequent. For example, in 2017, the VPD had 21,866 CFS that were specifically regarding suspicious circumstances, of which 91% of these were calls from concerned citizens regarding suspicious activity. It is a public expectation that the VPD respond and investigate these circumstances; the VPD is dedicated to high-quality service, which includes investigating all of these suspicious circumstances. Furthermore, the VPD is not solely a reactive organization. Towards proactively ensuring public safety, VPD officers regularly take initiative to investigate suspicious behaviours they view themselves.

An examination of VPD street check data reveals that VPD officers conducted 97,281 street checks between 2008 and 2017. Of these, approximately 8% were street checks that resulted from a community CFS (as depicted in Table 1).

Table 1. Street Check and Calls for Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STREET CHECKS</td>
<td>9,358</td>
<td>8,987</td>
<td>12,376</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>9,704</td>
<td>11,412</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>9,645</td>
<td>8,587</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>97,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY CFS THAT INITIATED STREET CHECKS</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>7,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of STREET CHECKS</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AT A GLANCE:**

A CITIZEN CONTACTED THE VPD REGARDING ASSISTANCE MOVING ALONG A GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS THAT WERE OPENLY DRINKING ALCOHOL AND URINATING IN PUBLIC. THE VPD ATTENDED AND CONDUCTED A STREET CHECK OF SEVEN INDIVIDUALS (SIX WERE INDIGENOUS AND ONE WAS CAUCASIAN). NONE OF THESE INDIVIDUALS HAD WARRANTS OR CONDITIONS THAT WERE BEING BREACHED. ALTHOUGH THE INDIVIDUALS WERE DRINKING ALCOHOL IN PUBLIC, NO ENFORCEMENT ACTION WAS TAKEN.

Well-being Checks for Citizens

In keeping with both VPD’s organizational commitment of compassion and a fundamental policing principle of ensuring safety, VPD officers play an important role in ensuring the well-being of citizens. Often, checking on the well-being involves those members of the community that are most vulnerable. For example, the number of overdoses and deaths associated with the on-going opioid crisis is staggering. To ensure public safety for all persons, VPD officers routinely interact with individuals with drug dependency issues to check on their well-being, ensure that they able to care for themselves, and to make them aware of available overdose prevention and treatment services. Another example is when VPD officers conduct well-being checks during the winter months, when temperatures drop below freezing and vulnerable members of the community are at risk for exposure to the elements. VPD officers will regularly check on homeless individuals and enquire if they have had a hot meal and whether they would like assistance in finding accommodation off the streets. During these interactions, the officer will frequently document the well-being street check and follow up on the street check to ensure the person’s condition has not deteriorated. Depending on the area where these well-being street checks are conducted, such as Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside (DTES),
Interactions with Persons with Mental Health Issues
For over 30 years, the VPD has been proactive regarding mental health, and has implemented programs and initiatives to improve outcomes relating to police interactions with persons living with mental health issues. Police officers regularly encounter persons living with mental health issues, including many who concurrently struggle with substance abuse, some who are not receiving necessary medical care and community support, and a number who may be in a state of crisis.

The VPD had seen a steady increase in the number of incidents where officers attend calls with persons living with mental health concerns, and in the majority of these incidents, there is no crime involved. In the last few years, however, there has been a leveling off of these incidents, which may be attributable to VPD's proactive initiatives to bring together different stakeholders and health authorities. Often, these calls represent quality of life issues for either the person living with mental health issues or the broader community. Moreover, a study of VPD victimization rates where a mental health factor is involved shows that persons living with mental health issues were 23 times more likely than the general population to be a victim of crime. More concerning is the fact that they were 15 times more likely to be a victim of violent crime. Given this data, preventative interactions with these individuals are important to reduce victimization and ensure safety.

VPD officers proactively work to facilitate care and mitigate risk by conducting well-being street checks, often with the goal of collaborating with health care partners to deliver proper community-based mental health support for those in need. The VPD is committed to pursuing access to care through health care providers, and proactive follow-up with supportive multi-disciplinary teams that focus on the well-being and recovery of the individual. Well-being street checks serve as a mechanism for VPD officers to improve quality of life for the individual and those in the community.

Helping with Housing: Homelessness
Findings show a steep increase in homelessness across Metro Vancouver, with 828 more people identified as homeless in 2017 compared to 2014, representing a 30% increase in homelessness. Within Vancouver in 2017, Indigenous individuals accounted for at least 21% of Vancouver's entire homeless population and 42.5% of Vancouver's unsheltered homeless.

Dealing with homelessness requires partnerships between all levels of government, as well as police, non-profit and co-operative housing providers, community support services to build safe and inclusive neighbourhoods. VPD officers often interact with homeless individuals to assess well-being and to offer information on resources such as shelter locations. Towards this goal, in 2009, the VPD developed the role of a Homeless Outreach and Supportive Housing Coordinator. The Constable in this position conducts outreach work with the homeless and coordinates with mental health, addiction, housing serving sectors, and municipal and provincial governments. The Constable also acts as a resource for external agencies, as well as internal sections within the VPD. In working with homeless individuals, street checks may be conducted to ensure interactions and the outcomes of offered services.
are noted, especially during extreme weather conditions. Furthermore, many homeless individuals struggle with other concurrent issues such as mental health and addiction issues; therefore, ensuring the well-being of these vulnerable individuals is important for public safety.

Of all street checks that the VPD conducted from 2008-2017, 23% were of individuals that are coded as “no fixed address” (NFA). A large majority (85%) of all NFA street checks are interactions with Indigenous Peoples and Caucasians. The ethnic breakdown of the 23% of NFA individuals street checked is as follows:

- 66% were Caucasian;
- 19% were Indigenous;
- 4% were Black;
- 2% were Asian;
- 1% were Hispanic;
- 1% Middle Eastern;
- 1% South Asian; and
- The remainder (7%) were of unknown ethnicity.

A Mechanism for Finding Missing Persons
Like all VPD investigative units, the VPD’s unit dedicated to missing individuals, the Missing Persons Unit (MPU), follows the same investigative process regardless of any demographic factor. The link between well-being street checks and positive outcomes for missing person cases exists. Specifically, VPD MPU investigations have found that well-being street checks have led to the location of missing persons, including those at high risk such as dementia patients or persons suffering from severe mental health issues. Often, citizens initiate a police report when they are concerned that their loved one is missing; however, relief comes when they learn that the VPD has had recent contact with that person documented in a street check.

**FAST FACTS:**

- Across 10 years (2008-2017), there were 3,988 street checks with Indigenous females.
- The majority of these women (53%) had been the subject of a missing persons report.

---

*a While an entry of NFA in PRIME-BC does not automatically mean that the person is homeless, it is the closest approximation the VPD can make from the available data about how many homeless people that are street checked.*
Street Checks Help Solve Criminal Investigations

Information from street checks is regularly used, directly and indirectly, to solve crimes by placing a suspect at a certain location, to confirm or refute alibis, and to identify other individuals who have been associated to the subject in question. For instance, street checks may be used to assist in corroborating information from sources and provide information to obtain warrants.

Indeed, street checks have been used in investigations to help solve serious crimes. There are many examples of such cases, including that of an attempted murder that was solved because of a street check. In this case, the victim was shot in the head and ultimately lost an eye. He was able to provide a general description of the female who shot him and details about an ongoing disagreement that he had with another male. The male was identified and a search on PRIME-BC revealed a street check where that male was in the company of a female, who was determined to be a possible suspect. A cigarette butt was found at the crime scene and a DNA analysis was conducted revealing a female DNA profile. The continuing investigation focused on the female suspect and led to the lawful acquisition of a sample of her DNA, which produced a match to the DNA found at the crime scene. The street check was vital to her identification as a possible suspect, allowing for additional investigative techniques. As a result, the investigation was successful and the suspect was charged with attempted murder.

“Street checks...provide police with useful information about relationships between potential suspects that... have the potential to uncover complex relationship between criminal networks”

Cohen, et al. (2014)

How are Street Checks Different From Other Police-Citizen Interactions?

The continuum of lawful authorities for police to detain an individual(s) and obtain identifying information from them in relation to an investigation, which falls outside of a street check, include:

- **Investigative Detention:** A detention that is based on an officer’s reasonable suspicion or articulable cause but falls short of reasonable and probable grounds for arrest. There must be a nexus between the individual detailed and a recent or ongoing offence that has been committed. An example may be a person walking on a deserted street at 3:00 am, carrying a backpack a block or two away from where a break and enter had just occurred. A situation such as this may provide grounds for detention, and potentially authority to conduct a pat down search for officer safety, if warranted, and would also justify the officer requesting the person provide some identifying information to the officer.¹¹

- **Statutory Authority:** Federal statutes such as the Criminal Code of Canada (CCC), as well as certain provincial statutes such as the British Columbia (B.C.) Motor Vehicle Act (MVA) in the case of driving activity, and certain municipal bylaws, provide police the authority to compel identification from a person when they have committed an
offence in relation to the statute or bylaw. For example, instances where a person is believed to have committed an offence under the CCC or the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA) but is not arrested and is issued an Appearance Notice, would justify the officer requesting identifying information from the person; and

- **Reasonable and Probable Grounds to Arrest:** Reasonable and probable grounds are grounds that would lead an ordinary, prudent and cautious person to have a strong and honest belief about the situation at issue. It is not sufficient for the police officer to subjectively believe that he/she has reasonable and probable grounds to make an arrest. Rather, it must also be shown that a reasonable person, standing in the shoes of the officer, would have believed that reasonable and probable grounds existed to make the arrest. However, the police need not go further and establish a *prima facie* case. When an officer has reasonable grounds to believe that a person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit an indictable offence, then s. 495 of the CCC provides authority for an arrest.

While a street check is not a detention, the police have legal authority to conduct street checks as they fall within the scope of the police duties under the B.C. Police Act, as well as the common law duties of police officers to preserve the peace and prevent and detect crime. Section 34(2) of the B.C. Police Act states that police must perform the duties and functions respecting the preservation of peace, the prevention of crime, and offences against the law. Therefore, police are lawfully authorized to stop and make inquiries of members of the public; however, if the citizen refuses to answer, the officer must allow the person to proceed unless the officer detains the individual for a lawful investigative purpose, or arrests the person. These types of stops and subsequent inquiries must not be arbitrary; they must be rooted in an officer’s observations of what they reasonably believe is suspicious activity by that person, or used to gather pertinent intelligence about suspicious activity. The courts have recognized that “not every interaction between the police and members of the public, even for investigative purposes, constitutes a detention within the meaning of the Charter. Section 9 of the Charter does not require that police abstain from interacting with members of the public until they have specific grounds to connect the individual to the commission of a crime.”

Street checks are not random activities that exist outside of articulable cause justifying police contact with an individual. Likewise, street checks are not the indiscriminate collection of personal information for the purposes of creating a database on members of the public nor as a reason to simply check if an unknown person has a warrant outstanding for their arrest or is under some court ordered conditions. The difference between an arbitrary stop and a legitimate street check is a vital distinction recognized by VPD members. Within a free and democratic society, where bias-free policing and respect for an individual’s Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Charter) rights are acknowledged, the absence of arbitrary detention is a societal expectation and legal requirement.
Rights of Citizens During Street Checks

VPD members are aware of citizens’ rights during a street check. In some of these situations, citizens may believe that they must comply with the officer’s requests. This type of psychological compulsion has been recognized in the Supreme Court of Canada, as stated in R. v. Grant (2009).  

“...not every interaction between the police and members of the public, even for investigative purposes, constitutes a detention within the meaning of the Charter. Section 9 of the Charter does not require that police abstain from interacting with members of the public until they have specific grounds to connect the individual to the commission of a crime.”

R. v. Suberu, 2009

If, during a street check, a citizen asks why they have been stopped, or the officer suspects through their own observations that a person may feel they are detained, then officers should provide an explanation for conducting the street check and advise the individual that they are not required to speak to or remain with the officer. This type of communication provides for transparency in police actions, helps prevent misunderstandings, and ensures police actions are lawful.

When conducting a street check under the above circumstances, absent any authority to detain, VPD officers obtain informed consent, as the person has the right to walk away and refuse to answer questions. “Absent statutory compulsion, everyone has the right to be silent in the face of police questioning, even if he or she is not detained.” This is a practice that commonly occurs in policing and officers understand their authorities.

---

b See also R v. Poole 2015 BCCA 464, where no physical or psychological detention occurred during the initial part of the interaction with the police
Documentation of Street Checks
In situations where interactions such as those outlined above occur, the police may, where warranted, enter the interaction in the PRIME-BC database. The purpose of entering information into a database is to document the interaction and information obtained from that person by a police officer. This may include details about individuals, vehicles, locations, dates, times, and the circumstances and justification for the contact by the police. As outlined in the example above, this information may be relevant to current or subsequent public safety investigations, as well as necessary for future officer safety and situational awareness. This information is lawfully gathered through the cooperation of the individual(s), or through their compliance with legislative requirements such as the MVA.

Training on Street Checks
Ensuring that VPD officers are well trained when dealing with the public and when conducting street checks is a departmental priority. VPD officers receive courses on lawful authorities as early as their initial recruit training, and officers continuously receive regular updates during their careers.

All VPD police officers undergo recruit training at the Justice Institute of British Columbia (JIBC) where they receive extensive instruction in police powers of detention/arrest, search and seizure, and relevant legislation, including the CCC and the Charter. All recruits are required to know their powers of arrest and detention, and are assessed with written examinations and by practical simulation scenarios. This type of training provides future frontline patrol members of the VPD with a solid foundation and understanding of their legal powers and responsibilities.

Recruit level and in-service training reinforces the importance of appropriate and lawful interactions with the public. Officers are trained to understand that effective interactions establish trusting relationships, facilitate the exchange of information, and ensure the safety of citizens. Members must know that every person has the right to be free from arbitrary detention as detailed in Section 9 of the Charter. It is also emphasized to members that without appropriate grounds, citizens are not obligated to answer questions, produce identification, or remain at a scene.

In addition, the VPD provides in-service training and internet resources pertaining to psychological detention. In 2017, as a part of annual legal update training, frontline VPD members were provided training specifically on street checks and arbitrary detention. In addition, the law relevant to street checks is included in the VPD’s Legal Exam Study Package, and has often been subject to examination (e.g., in promotional processes).

Concerns Related to the Use of Street Checks
Albeit a valuable policing strategy, the use of street checks has been questioned by some members of the community in Canada. Specifically, concerns have been raised about the lawfulness of street checks, as well as suggestions that certain demographic groups are disproportionately street checked. For example, significant controversy has surrounded police street checks in Ontario, where some police agencies have received public criticism regarding their practices and lack of policy surrounding the "carding" (another term for street checks) of individuals. Many of these types of stops were alleged to be based on profiling on
the prohibited grounds for discrimination as set out in the *Ontario Human Rights Code*, specifically race. Public dissatisfaction surrounding this practice were related to the following themes:

- Arbitrary police stops;
- No reasons provided for the contact;
- Collection of irrelevant information; and
- Perceived discrimination.

A series of studies concluded that street checks in Ontario reflected racial profiling and biased policing. Similarily, a submission on carding and street checks submitted to Ontario’s Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (MCSCS) by Legal Aid Ontario in 2015 argued that police street checks disproportionately impacted persons from racialized communities (those that are non-Caucasian) and those in vulnerable groups.

As a result of the growing controversy surrounding carding practices, the Province of Ontario’s MCSCS conducted an extensive review of the matter. As part of the review, MCSCS asked for community responses on a number of issues concerning street checks and police-public interactions. Based on the review, the Province of Ontario enacted Province of Ontario enacted in January 2017 Ontario Regulation 58/16, *Collection of Identifying Information in Certain Circumstances – Prohibition and Duties*. The legislation sets out what the government refers to as "clear and consistent rules" for voluntary police-public interactions. Specifically, the legislation sets out guidelines for police officers with respect to stopping persons and attempting “to collect identifying information by asking the individual, in a face-to-face encounter...to identify himself or herself or to provide information for the purpose of identifying the individual and includes such an attempt to do so, whether or not identifying information is collected".

The regulations apply if an officer asks the person for identifying information or to see an identifying document while:

- Looking into suspicious activities;
- Gathering intelligence; and
- Investigating possible criminal activity.

The regulations do not apply if police ask for identifying information or to see an identifying document while:

- Conducting a traffic stop;
- Arresting or detaining someone;
- Executing a warrant; and
- Investigating a specific crime.

The legislation also stipulates, among other factors, that officers must inform citizens that they have a right not to speak to police or produce identification in cases other than arrest, detainment, or when a search warrant is executed. The rules do not apply to undercover operations. Moreover, the legislation establishes training, data management, and reporting requirements about the collection of identifying information.
According to the MCSCS Minister, “these new rules protect the rights of people who are not under investigation while also laying the foundation for more positive, trusting, and respectful relationships between police and the public.” The intent of the policy is to prevent police from collecting information on persons based on the way they look or where they live. Based on the guidelines set out in the provincial legislation, agencies across Ontario have adopted a new set of policies about how officers interact with the public and conduct street checks.

Currently, it is not clear whether “provincial legislation has reduced racial profiling and biased policing and if there are now fewer instances in which persons who are stopped by the police feel that they have been racially profiled and subjected to psychological detention.” This may be attributable, according to some researchers, to the failure of research studies to set a baseline of police activity against which the impact of changes in policy and legislation could be assessed.

Due to the ongoing controversy surrounding carding in Ontario, the Province of Ontario appointed Justice Michael Tulloch to review the Province’s regulation on street checks. Justice Tulloch and his team are undertaking a full and independent review of Ontario Regulation 58/16; this review entails an examination of all relevant materials (e.g., training, policies, and procedures) and includes extensive public consultation processes. Justice Tulloch will be “reviewing the content of the Regulation and assessing whether police officers, chiefs of police, and police services boards are complying with it. More specifically, the Review will assess whether the Regulation reflects the provincial government’s goal of ensuring that police-public relations are consistent, bias-free and done in a way that promotes public confidence and protects human rights”. By January 2019, Justice Tulloch will be making recommendations to the government about those laws and their implementation.

Concerns regarding street checks have been raised outside of Ontario as well. Specifically, in Edmonton, the issue of street checks came to the forefront after a media outlet requested information from the Edmonton Police Service (EPS) regarding their street check figures and found that more than 26,000 street checks were occurring per year between 2011 and 2014. In 2016, the EPS conducted a review of their street check process and noted that there were some deficiencies in the information collected from street checks (e.g., they were being used to document interactions that may be captured in other police databases and not as street checks) and that there was not much direction as to what should be included. As a result of this review, in October of 2017, a procedure that details street checks was updated. The updated procedure outlines specific reasons why a street check is conducted and that within the street check, the reason for it being conducted must be articulated.

Also in 2017, a Freedom of Information (FOI) request by the Edmonton chapter of Black Lives Matter revealed that Indigenous and Black persons were street checked disproportionately by the EPS. In addition, Indigenous women were 10 times as likely to be street checked as Caucasian women. The EPS responded that their street checks are not random and they are conducted in response to suspicious behaviours; however, in media coverage, the street checks were continually being described as random in nature. The Government of Alberta is not issuing any actual bans on street checks due to this distinction between a random and reactive check. Both the Government of Alberta and the EPS have stated that these checks are not random and consequently there is no necessity to prohibit them.
In response to the criticisms, the Edmonton Police Commission ordered an external review of the street checks. A research team led by Dr. Curt Griffiths conducted this review. Similarly, the Alberta Provincial Government engaged in community consultation in late 2017.36 These consultations are part of a process to develop provincial guidelines over the street check process.

Regarding the issue of evidence of racial bias, in his review, Dr. Griffiths et al., stated that “[the disproportional street check figures] does not, in itself, indicate that the police racially profile Indigenous persons and visible minorities as there is no data available on the context in which they were stopped. Further analysis would be required, using data not available to the present study, to determine this.”37

Regulating Street Checks: Are there Reductions in Proactive Policing in Canada?
The introduction of the guidelines in Ontario does, however, appear to have contributed to a significant reduction in the number of street checks conducted by some police services. According to a CBC news report in 2017, “police leaders [in Ontario] have stated that their officers are reluctant to conduct street checks due to the complexities surrounding the provincial regulations and legislation.”38 It is estimated that the Ontario Provincial Police conducted less than 100 street checks in 2017 compared to approximately 40,000 in years prior.39 The Ottawa Police Service recorded seven street checks between March and December of 2017 in contrast to approximately 45,000 street checks conducted between 2011 and 2014.40 This outcome is commonly referred to as de-policing, “wherein police officers reduce their levels of proactive engagement with community residents”.41 It has been a concern that officers may react with de-policing in the face of allegations of racial profiling, amongst other factors (e.g. riots, civil suits). 42

Based on a review of the EPS, there is some evidence that de-policing is beginning to occur in Edmonton. 43 Specifically, “a number of officers in the focus groups and in the field observations indicated that they were significantly reducing, or in some cases eliminating, conducting street checks. This may have significant consequences for the safety and well-being of communities.” Similarly, officers in Ontario have argued that the provincial street check legislation has restricted their ability to conduct important proactive policing work and has had a negative impact on investigations. As explained by Chief Evans of Peel Regional Police, the legislation has restricted police whereby “the criminal is saying no one is going to stop me and I can carry [sic] my gun and my knife and that is a real problem in the community.”44 Additionally, the legislation has had an adverse impact on investigations, “there is very little intelligence out there because the criminals are feeling very empowered.”

Importance of Perceptions of Procedural Justice
Evidence of racial discrimination and stereotyping has been documented in various areas of society, including labour markets,45,46 mortgage lending practices,47,48 healthcare settings,49 and popular media.50 Further, there is evidence that racially and ethnically diverse children may experience racial biases and racial profiling as early as high school or even elementary school, up to and including graduate school.51,52,53 Racial profiling is seen at every age, and even serving police officers themselves are not immune from racism, racial trauma, and racial profiling.54,55,56
Psychological and Physical Impact of Profiling

Those who experience profiling personally suffer psychologically and, in some cases, even physically. Early experiences of apparent racial discrimination or racial profiling can have significant, long-lasting impacts and include outcomes such as school dropouts, lower grades, adolescent anger, anti-social behaviour, and lower self-esteem.

Research has demonstrated a strong statistical relationship between racial/ethnic discrimination and mental health indicators in adults. More specifically, racial discrimination has been linked to anxiety, depressive symptoms, acute and chronic stress, psychological distress, post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms, lower well-being, happiness, and general life satisfaction.

Although the specific pathways through which racism can affect physical health remain unclear, there is empirical evidence that racial/ethnic discrimination can also engender physical health issues. For instance, African American college students who reported experiences of racial/ethnic harassment were twice as likely to use tobacco products daily compared to their peers who didn’t report harassment experiences and it is plausible their smoking habits were prompted at least in part by the minority stress they experienced.

The nexus between psychological and physical health issues is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that victims of persistent racial prejudice and self-reported “everyday discrimination” tend to be more prone to carotid plaque and hypertension especially if they internalize their frustration and do not openly challenge their unfair treatment. Even worse, mothers exposed to lifelong racial discrimination are more likely to give birth to very low birthweight infants, even after controlling for prenatal care as well as sociodemographic, biomedical, and behavioural characteristics. In fact, even short-lived but acute ethnic discrimination appears to be sufficient to induce poorer birth outcomes.

Impact on Society

In terms of social outcomes, racial/ethnic discrimination can also lead to an increased risk of criminalization through the internalization of “deviant” or “troublemaker” personality traits, or greater hostility towards persons in positions of authority. Perceived or expected racial discrimination by police may reduce the incentives for certain teenagers to stay out of trouble. From a policing perspective, this perpetuates a vicious cycle where individuals who are profiled or feel profiled become more likely to “act out” or respond defiantly thereby confirming in a self-fulfilling manner the suspicions of the very same people who profiled them. At an aggregate level, racial profiling is expected to have an ambiguous effect on crime and may even contribute to increase it.

Impact on Public Trust and Confidence in Police

Public trust and confidence in the police are known to be strongly influenced by public perceptions and judgments around the impartiality of police officers when they apply or exercise their authority, a criteria commonly referred to as “procedural fairness” or “procedural justice”. These constructs matter since public trust and confidence in the police are both closely related to the public’s willingness to obey the law, cooperate with police, and support policies that give police more discretionary power. In fact, past research has shown that procedural justice considerations remain important even for hardened criminals, when people face serious immediate security threats, and when another group is the target of police profiling.
In a context where citizen evaluations of police as a whole and individual officers specifically depend largely on the perceived legitimacy of police actions during routine encounters, the way street checks are conducted is apparently significant. In particular, any actual or perceived racial profiling is problematic because it creates perceptions of procedural injustice. This remains true even for individuals who do not experience racial profiling directly but vicariously.

Even worse, there are signs that adverse experiences tend to deeply (and negatively) affect attitudes toward the police while positive contacts have a much tamer beneficial impact and are insufficient to rebuild trust and confidence in police once it is compromised. In a phone survey of 721 New York City residents conducted in January 2001, for example, 76% of respondents believed that racial profiling was a widespread practice at the New York Police Department, even though 61% also reported having a good experience with police in the past.

**Training on Fair and Impartial Policing**

Recently, the VPD has implemented a program of Fair and Impartial Policing (FIP) training, a full day workshop delivered to more than 600 frontline operational members. Developed in the United States, FIP was adopted and redesigned by the Provincial Government in response to the 2012 B.C. Missing Women’s Commission of Inquiry (MWCI). Specifically, the Inquiry recommended that police officers in B.C. undergo mandatory training concerning vulnerable community members.

The workshop illustrates how implicit biases may affect police perception and behaviour, and as a result negatively affect community members. The objective of the FIP workshop is to help police officers recognize “implicit-bias” and develop skills and tactics to reduce the influence of bias on police practice. There is specific focus given to the effect of bias on Indigenous and Black communities. A fundamental concept in the training is that all people can have biases that could influence actions and that policing based on stereotypes can be unsafe, ineffective, and importantly—unjust. Learning objectives in FIP training include the following:

1. Reflect on the lived experience of an Indigenous person who experienced racial profiling by a police officer and how it impacted them;

2. Understand biases are normal and that all people, even well-intentioned, have biases;

3. Explain why persons who are part of a vulnerable population are likely to be subject to implicit bias;

4. Explain how implicit bias played a role in investigations of missing women in the DTES of Vancouver (as described in the MWCI);

5. Reflect upon and articulate the impact biased policing has on community members;

6. Explain the importance of police legitimacy and the threats to it;

7. Describe some historical examples of threats to police legitimacy in Canada;
8. Explain how procedural justice produces police legitimacy and be able to articulate the major components of procedural justice;

9. Explain and demonstrate strategies that will help them be aware of personal biases; and

10. Explain and demonstrate strategies (i.e. FIP skills) for ensuring that their behaviour is bias free.

The VPD’s Diverse Community Engagement Philosophy

The VPD acknowledges the concerns that have been raised regarding racial profiling and it is the VPD’s unquestionable view that no policing practice be conducted in any discriminatory manner. The VPD realizes and respects the importance of the B.C. Human Rights Code, as well as the Canadian Human Rights Act, which prohibit discrimination against any person on grounds including race, place of origin, colour, religion, and sex. Rather, the VPD embraces Vancouver’s blend of diverse cultural groups, ethnicities, and religions from all over the world and Canada’s Indigenous communities. The VPD ensures active engagement with the culturally diverse communities it serves. A strategic goal in the current VPD Strategic Plan is to foster relationships, understanding, and trust with diverse communities. Accordingly, the VPD consistently participates in community engagement initiatives. These include participation in community events such as the Pulling Together Canoe Journey, the annual Pride Parade, the Chinese New Year Parade, the Vaisakhi parade, amongst well over 200 outreach events annually.

In addition, to bridge gaps between police and the community, the VPD has established several full-time community liaison positions. These include a full-time position each of a Sex Industry Liaison Officer, a Homeless Outreach and Supportive Housing Coordinator, a dedicated police officer at the Aboriginal Community Police Centre, a Musqueam Liaison Officer, an Indigenous Liaison Officer, and an Indigenous Liaison Protocol Officer. These positions are a vital component of the VPD’s strategic mission to work with the community and have been received positively by the community. Further, the MWCI provided positive feedback on VPD’s work carried out by liaison officers in these positions.

Stemming from long-term systemic issues resulting from colonization, racism, and the Residential School system, the VPD recognizes that Indigenous Peoples are overrepresented among survival sex workers. To open lines of communication and foster increased engagement, the VPD implemented the “Sex Work Enforcement Guidelines” in January 2013 as a guiding document to establish a process by which the VPD will work with the sex industry community to open lines of communication and foster increased engagement. The Sex Work Enforcement Guidelines also assist frontline officers in understanding the VPD’s philosophy and expectations regarding the investigation of crime in the sex industry.

The VPD values building relationships with those involved in the sex industry to increase the safety of the workers, reduce victimization and violence, and where appropriate (such as with youth) assist with exit strategies. In all situations, VPD officers will treat those in the sex industry with respect and dignity. These guidelines outline response strategies, and ensure a
consistent and respectful message when VPD officers deal with anyone involved in the sex industry.

In his MWCI report, Commissioner Wally Oppal supported the VPD’s Sex Enforcement Guidelines. Specifically, he commended the community engagement process taken in their development, while referring to guidelines as “a model of community policing at its best.” Further, in the recommendations, Commissioner Oppal suggested that all other police forces in B.C. consider implementing similar guidelines.

Initiatives and Activities Engaging Women and Girls

There are systemic issues that have resulted in disproportionate police interaction with Indigenous Peoples, and led to increased vulnerability of Indigenous females. For example, Indigenous women experience higher rates of violent victimization than non-Indigenous women do, with domestic violence being the most pervasive form of victimization experienced.

Indigenous women were also found to be significantly overrepresented as sex industry workers compared to non-Indigenous women. The literature has documented that sexual and physical violence is common for women in the sex trade. For example, the authors in one study (which focused specifically on the Vancouver sex trade) interviewed 101 women, 52 of whom were Indigenous. The overwhelming majority (82%) of these women reported both a history of childhood sexual abuse by multiple perpetrators and either being sexually (78%) or physically assaulted (90%) while working in the sex industry. Given these alarming rates, the VPD has proactive programming and community events aimed specifically at engaging Indigenous women and girls to build awareness on violence against them, such as SisterWatch, as outlined in the following section.

SisterWatch

Women in Vancouver’s DTES area are particularly vulnerable to violence, injury, and death. Crime statistics in the DTES have never truly reflected the danger facing the women who live there. Whether the cause is fear of reprisals or general distrust of authority, women have traditionally been reluctant to report crimes against themselves and others.
Following the tragic death of Ashley Machiskinic, the SisterWatch Project began in December 2010 with regular Town Hall meetings consisting of members of the DTES community and VPD members (including the Chief Constable, members of the VPD Executive/senior management, as well as frontline officers), who together form the SisterWatch Committee. The guiding principle of this committee is to provide a safe space for residents of the DTES to voice their concerns and to keep community members informed of police progress concerning investigations, as well as any advances in community safety.

In addition to the Town Hall meetings, the SisterWatch Project also established the SisterWatch tip line, a special telephone hotline established and staffed by civilian women trained to assist callers who are concerned about their safety. This tip line encourages members of the community to come forward with information regarding crimes of gender violence, the death of Ashley Machiskinic, or any other safety concerns. Furthermore, a SisterWatch Reward of $10,000 was established for information that proves how and why Ms. Machiskinic fell to her death from a window of a hotel on Hastings Street on September 15, 2010. To date, no information has come forward.

In order to raise awareness for the SisterWatch Project, special events are held throughout the year to promote the ongoing activities and functions of the SisterWatch Committee and the SisterWatch tip line. As well as attending and hosting events promoting awareness, the SisterWatch Committee also participates in several community and cultural events.

Arising from a recommendation in the MWCI, an evaluation of SisterWatch was completed in 2015, which indicates that SisterWatch has had a positive impact on the VPD, the women and Indigenous organizations in the DTES, and their relationships with each other. As stated in the independent evaluation, “Is it worth the work involved? There is clear evidence that SisterWatch is worth it.” Further, the enhanced relationships and developing trust has contributed to important investigations and judicially successful cases; notably, these cases would not have come to light without SisterWatch. As outlined in the evaluation, “The capacity of women’s advocates to connect with the VPD senior leadership has had a positive impact on the way in which conflict is addressed between those involved in the committee and therefore how conflict is resolved. This, in turn, has opened the door to collaboration and mutual support…”

A Focus on Indigenous Youth
The literature on the victimization of Canada’s Indigenous youth population is dark. Childhood sexual abuse against Indigenous youth has been found to be prevalent, according to some studies. On average, 25% to 50% of Indigenous women were victims of sexual abuse as children compared to 20% to 25% average within the non-Indigenous population. The results of the 2014 General Social Survey revealed that more crimes that were violent in nature were committed against Indigenous youth than their older counterparts.

Further emphasizing the need for proactive measures, there is a correlation between childhood domestic victimization, and both subsequent victimization and criminal activity later in life. There is an association between the severity of the abuse and the likelihood of the victim becoming involved in juvenile delinquency—this is particularly the case among males. In light of these serious findings, and towards preventative programming, the VPD has many youth-oriented initiatives in place. For example, the VPD’s Indigenous Cadet
Program, established in 2007, continues to successfully employ Indigenous applicants per cohort, with the focus on promoting employment and career development opportunities for Indigenous Peoples within law enforcement agencies. The program runs annually from June until the end of August and successful applicants spend half of that time working with the VPD fleet services to gain valuable work experience. The other half is spent on "ride-alongs" with various sections of the VPD, to gain greater understanding and insight into the numerous functions of the police department. Applicants also participate in the annual Pulling Together Canoe Journey. The outcomes of the program are promising. For example, of the cadets that have completed the program, 38% have gone on to be hired by law enforcement agencies. The VPD has hired 35% of the cadets and 18% of them have become police officers.

Increasing Cultural Competency: VPD Training Initiatives

The VPD is sensitive to unique needs associated with particular communities. For example, the Indigenous Peoples of Canada include diverse groups of Peoples with distinct cultural and social characteristics. For police and other law enforcement personnel, understanding the unique history and culture of Indigenous Peoples is an important part of effective communication and interaction with the Indigenous Peoples, and communities they serve. The VPD ensures staff are educated with cultural competency training, described in the following sections.

Circle of Understanding

The Circle of Understanding serves as cultural competency training for all municipal police recruits. This training was designed to help increase knowledge and understanding of Indigenous culture, history and heritage, with an emphasis on the history of colonization in Canada and the impact of Residential Schools upon Indigenous Peoples. During the training, the film “The Spirit Has No Colour” is screened for recruits and participants hear stories from Residential School survivors to fully comprehend the extent of trauma and suffering endured. An Elder is often in attendance to impart wisdom and culture through singing and drumming, and the Indigenous Liaison Officer helps to lead a smudging ceremony. In addition, the VPD Indigenous Liaison and Musqueam Liaison Officers have lead several training sessions with various municipal police forces in order to increase cultural understanding and awareness of Indigenous topics within policing beyond the walls of the VPD.

Aboriginal and First Nations Awareness Course

A six-hour e-Learning course has been delivered since 2016 to all new VPD members hired from other police agencies. The Aboriginal and First Nations Awareness course provides basic knowledge of the history and geography of Indigenous Peoples. It is the foundation for understanding contemporary issues pertaining to Indigenous lands, cultures, and communities. This course has several learning outcomes:

1. An understanding of who Indigenous Peoples are and definitions of the terms that are commonly used to refer to Indigenous peoples in Canada;

2. Knowledge of the history, geography, and demographic characteristics of Indigenous Peoples;
3. Understanding how Indigenous Peoples perceive relationships with land;

4. Recollection of the history of Indigenous treaties;

5. Defining culture and its influence on the Indigenous way of life, communication, and points of view;

6. Recognition of the characteristics of the six Indigenous cultural regions in Canada;

7. Familiarity with the differences between Indigenous and traditional Western cultures; and

8. Understanding the impact of the various social and economic factors facing Indigenous communities across Canada today.

**VPD Aboriginal Cultural Competency Training**

Aboriginal Cultural Competency (ACC) training was designed to increase knowledge, enhance self-awareness, and strengthen the skills of those who work both directly and indirectly with Indigenous Peoples. The goal of the ACC training was to further develop individual competencies and promote positive partnerships. Participants learned about aspects of colonial history such as Residential Schools, a timeline of historical events, and contexts for understanding social disparities and inequities. Through interactive activities, participants examined culture, stereotyping, and the consequences and legacies of colonization. Participants were also introduced to tools for developing more effective communication and relationship building skills. Two Residential School survivors and Elders from the Indigenous community conducted this training, in 2015, for approximately 650 frontline members, volunteers, and civilian staff of the VPD.

**Special Municipal Constable Program: Indigenous Peoples’ Awareness Course**

The Community Awareness: Indigenous Peoples’ Awareness course has been a mandatory component of the Special Municipal Constable Program since 2014. Through the use of the video “The Spirit Has No Colour” and classroom discussion, learners become familiar with the impact of European contact on Indigenous culture, the role of law enforcement and its impact on Indigenous culture, and the steps law enforcement may take to build relationships. Learning outcomes of this course include:

1. Development of an awareness of the history of Indigenous Peoples, particularly in B.C.;

2. Familiarity with the role of police in the enforcement of the laws of Canada that today are deemed to have been damaging to Indigenous Peoples, destructive to their culture, language and spiritual values and practices, and based on the belief that Indigenous Peoples are culturally inferior;

3. Demonstration of an understanding of the consequences of generations of children being taken from their families and placed into the Residential Schools of this country,
systematically destroying family systems, and possible learning of family practices and parenting skills; and

4. The ability to demonstrate an understanding of the connection between drug and alcohol abuse, family disintegration, and the loss of cultural identity to the sexual, psychological, physical and other abuse that was common in Residential Schools.

Diversity and Inclusion in our Workforce

Ethnic Diversity

Through recruitment initiatives that place value on diversity, VPD employees represent a myriad of ethnicities. Almost 30% of VPD employees are visible minorities (see Table 2 below). This data includes VPD police officers, Community Safety Personnel, Jail Guards, VPD civilian employees, Special Constables, Traffic Authority members, and casual employees. Of note, these figures are derived upon self-disclosure or subjective assessment and deviations can be expected.

Table 2. Ethnicity of VPD Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Visible Minority</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sworn &amp; Civilian</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Diversity

One benefit of VPD’s ethnic diversity is the various language skills that employees offer. These language skills translate to improved service to the community and provide employees with the ability to directly communicate with diverse communities. Language skills are beneficial during criminal investigations to ensure that suspects are able to communicate with police officers and understand their rights and reason for arrest. The VPD employs staff that speak over 50 languages.

Gender Diversity

In addition to ethnic and language diversity, the VPD places value on fair representation between genders. Currently, females make up almost 36% of VPD employees while 64% of all employees are males. This gender diversity is also represented in the composition of VPD frontline staff; 26% of VPD’s police officers are females, while 74% are males.
Exploring the Concept of Disproportionality and Ethnicity

As outlined earlier, recently, there have been reports in the media that have concluded that the police in some Canadian cities disproportionately street check persons who are Indigenous or Black. Some have concluded that street checks are therefore discriminatory; a violation of human, Charter, and privacy rights; and these conclusions are often based on the argument that population ratios and street check ratios are not aligned. Data released by the VPD in a FOI request showed that in a 10-year period, the VPD conducted 97,281 street checks. Specifically, in 2017:

- The VPD conducted 6,322 street checks;
- 83% of these were of males and 14% females;
- 57% of the street checks were of Caucasians;
- 16% of the street checks were of Indigenous Peoples; and
- 5% of the street checks were of Black individuals.

Upon the release of this FOI data, the VPD received a Service or Policy complaint submitted to the OPCC by the UBCIC and the BCCLA. The complaint states that, based on the release, the “data create a strong suggestion that street checks are being conducted in a discriminatory manner”; this conclusion is based on the rationale that the proportion of ethnicities that are street checked, does not match their proportion in the population of Vancouver. Specifically, if Indigenous Peoples make up approximately 2% of the Vancouver population and 16% street checks as a ratio implies, the VPD are over-street checking Indigenous Peoples. Likewise, there were 5% of Black persons street checked in 2017; however, Black persons comprise 1% of Vancouver’s population. In 2017, 57% of Caucasians were street checked, and Caucasians make up 46% of Vancouver’s population.

There are several methodological issues and challenges stemming from the above interpretations and inferences that have been drawn. First, we must choose a proper comparison benchmark. In general, the relevant base is rarely the larger population of residents who live in the area. For example, the relevant base when analyzing vehicle stops along a certain stretch of highway is not the population who resides around it but the population of drivers who drive along that highway or, a better comparison, the population of all drivers who commit traffic infractions or violate traffic laws regardless of whether they were stopped by police or not.

In order to appropriately determine whether there are disparities between population subgroups in the aggregate street check data, that data must be compared against a meaningful benchmark, reflecting who is available or likely to be stopped by police not merely who lives in the area or who could be checked if police checks were conducted completely capriciously. Ultimately, the goal is to appropriately capture each subgroup’s level of exposure so we can assess whether they are truly at greater likelihood of being checked by police, controlling for the circumstances that would lawfully justify police attention. If population subgroups are overrepresented in the police street check data, it does not validate that discretionary police decisions are driven by racial biases or other discriminatory factors.

---

\(^c\) This is the total number of street checks or interactions. This is not a reflection of distinct or unique individuals.

\(^d\) Gender was not recorded for the remainder.
Secondly, it is important to recognize that some population subgroups may be overrepresented in the police street check data because of factors that are unrelated to racial biases. For example, social factors might explain the disproportionate rate of police contacts. It is widely acknowledged that street checks and traffic stops by police are not random and that they are deliberate police activities to advance public safety. As well, it is plausible that police attention could be “legitimately triggered” by the behaviour of the people who are street checked. This is supported by empirical research which found that street youths are more likely to be stopped by police if they use drugs or alcohol and engage in delinquent behaviour, or sleep on the street, and not simply because of their ethnicity.

Furthermore, an alarming and disturbing statistic is that across Canada, Indigenous Peoples are consistently overrepresented in homeless counts, they are 10 times more likely to use a homeless shelter, and are even more likely to be living on the street, unsheltered, or “absolutely homeless”. Sadly, within Metro Vancouver in 2017, Indigenous Peoples accounted for 34% of the entire homeless population and almost 37.5% of the unsheltered homeless. It would be unrealistic to expect that police contacts at an aggregate level would remain unaffected by all these troubling societal issues and risk factors.

Besides overt racism and racial prejudice, unconscious cognitive bias or stereotyping is an insidious and problematic pathway, because it is based on the illusory idea and false assumption that a correlation exists among separate members of society who share common physical or socio-economic characteristics. Officers who subconsciously adopt these stereotypes might tend to be generally more suspicious of certain subgroups or people who adopt certain behaviours and exhibit anti-social cues. Not all stereotyping is necessarily unlawful or based on legally protected ground such as ethnicity, race, or skin colour. However, stereotyping based on ethnicity, race, or skin colour leads to racial biases and contradicts basic principles of procedural justice and fairness.

This pathway of “differential treatment” is supported by academic research hinting, for example, that Black high school students in Toronto appeared more likely than their peers to self-report being stopped and searched by police and Canadian youth who identified as Indigenous, Black, Middle Eastern or West Asian were more likely to self-report being questioned by police, even after controlling for various demographic, behavioural and other risk factors.

Ethnic Disproportionality in VPD Data: Examining Victims and Offenders
Patterns of disproportionality exist depending on the variable being examined. For example, as outlined, Indigenous Peoples are overrepresented in Vancouver’s homeless population. Similar patterns of ethnic disproportionality also exist when we examine data on ethnicity of offenders and victims.

Who are the Victims of Crime?
To demonstrate the concept of disproportionality in police data other than street checks, we examined ethnicity as it relates to victimization rates over the last ten years. Generally, the ethnicities of victims in three categories of offences have been consistent in the last ten years, specifically Violent Crime, Property Crime (break and enters, theft, theft of/from motor

---

*Gold (2003) and Melchers (2003) correctly point out that, because it is virtually impossible to completely and accurately account for ALL possible risk factors or cues that would provide a lawful explanation for police stops, it is a logical leap to attribute ANY unexplained statistical discrepancy specifically to race.*
vehicles, possession of stolen property, fraud, arson, mischief), and Total Crime (which includes violent, property, and all other crime). Further, there is variation in terms of ethnicity and types of victimization, as outlined in Table 3, below. For example, on average, Indigenous Peoples represented 13.7% of Violent Crime victims, Black persons were victimized in 2.9% of Violent Crime and for comparison purposes, Caucasians represented 50.5% of Violent Crime victims. Therefore, ethnicity of victims, like ethnicity of street checked individuals, does not match population ratios (see Appendix A for full data on victimization and ethnicity from 2008 to 2017).

Table 3. Ethnicity of Victims (2008-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Total Crime</th>
<th>Vancouver Population (Census 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like ethnicity, disproportionality, also exists when we examine the gender of victims, as outlined in Table 4, below. The data illustrates that males, on average, are more often the victims of all types of crime (see Appendix B for full data on gender and victimization from 2008 to 2017).

Table 4. Gender of Victims (2008-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Total Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who are the Criminal Offenders?
As outlined in Table 5, when examining data over the last decade, Caucasians made up the greatest portion of offenders. Specifically, on average, 49.2% of violent offenders, and 56.4% of Property Crime offenders are Caucasian. On average, 16.3% of violent offenders and 10.9% of property offenders were Indigenous. Finally, 4.7% and 2.9% of Violent and Property Crime offenders were Black, correspondingly (see Appendix C for full data on ethnicity of offenders, across 10 years).

---

\(^f\) See https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/statistical-programs/instrument/3302_Q1_V2 for more information.
Table 5. Ethnicity of Offenders (2008-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Total Crime</th>
<th>Vancouver Population (Census 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of crime category, males are more often offenders than females. For example, from 2008 to 2017, 22.9% of females committed Violent Crime, compared to 76.9% of males. Likewise, more males (71.3%) are offenders of Property Crime, compared to females (28.6%). This data illustrates that victim and offender data is inconsistent with population ratios (see Appendix D for full data on gender of offenders, across crime times and across 10 years).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Total Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indigenous Peoples in Correctional Services

Indigenous Peoples are significantly overrepresented in rates of incarceration. While Indigenous representation in the Canadian population is approximately 5%, Indigenous adults accounted for 28% of admission to provincial/territorial correctional services, with similar rates (27%) for federal correctional services in 2016/2017. The rate of Indigenous offenders in custody has been on the rise for over a decade. In 2006/2007, 21% of adults admitted to provincial/territorial correctional services, and 20% in federal corrections were Indigenous. Interestingly, according to data from Statistics Canada, 1,535 persons were accused of homicide Canada-wide between 2014 and 2016 inclusively and 32.6% (500) of this group were identified as Indigenous. In B.C. specifically, the proportion of Indigenous accused of homicide was 19% (33/174).

These trends for Indigenous adults are aligned with Indigenous youth. Indigenous youth account for approximately 8% of the Canadian youth population, yet accounted for 46% of admission to correctional services in 2016/2017. These youth are overrepresented in custody (50%) and community admissions (42%). When comparing against gender, the differences are stark. For example, Indigenous females accounted for 60% of all female youth in custody, compared to 40% of non-Indigenous females. Many factors contribute to these alarming rates. As an example, as outlined by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the
overrepresentation of youth in the child welfare system may contribute to higher rates of Indigenous youth in custody.\textsuperscript{165}

These high custody rates have been linked to historical factors that have been acknowledged by the Supreme Court of Canada.\textsuperscript{166} Specifically, in sentencing, factors related to Indigenous social history must be considered by the courts. These factors include poverty, substance abuse, victimization, among other factors. The intergenerational impacts of the Residential School system is also a key factor. The high rates of Indigenous Peoples in the criminal justice system is well-documented, and is reflected in police data as well.

\textbf{MANY OF TODAY’S ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUTH ARE LIVING WITH THE LEGACY OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS, AS THEY STRUGGLE TO DEAL WITH HIGH RATES OF ADDICTION, FETAL ALCOHOL SPECTRUM DISORDER, MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES, FAMILY VIOLENCE, THE INCARCERATION OF PARENTS, AND THE INTRUSION OF CHILD WELFARE AUTHORITIES. ALL OF THESE FACTORS PLACE THEM AT GREATER RISK OF INVOLVEMENT WITH CRIME. IN ADDITION, THE OVER-INCARCERATION OF ABORIGINAL ADULTS (ALSO TIED TO THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS) HAS REPERCUSSIONS FOR THEIR CHILDREN.}

\textbf{TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (2015)}

\textbf{Who is Being Street Checked and Where?}

\textbf{Prevention Strategies for Repeat Offenders}

A solid body of criminological research has illustrated that much of crime is committed by repeat offenders. For example, Sherman found that less than 3\% of the individuals in his sample of one year had produced over 60\% of all arrests in that year.\textsuperscript{167} Similar results have been found by others, and this forms the basis for a key goal of policing to deter repeat offenders. Moreover, a concept in crime analysis is that of the \textit{Pareto Principle}, commonly referred to as the \textit{80-20 Rule}. That is, the idea that 80\% of outcomes are due to 20\% of causes. This concept has been observed with repeat offenders; specifically, large portions of criminal incidents are committed by a small portion of offenders.\textsuperscript{168}

Given that repeat offenders often engage in criminal activity in repeat locations, it is essential that police continue to incorporate proactive policing in their crime prevention strategies. This includes the use of information from the community that may be gathered from street checks. Other relevant information may include understanding whom these criminals target and information such as locations and time of offences.
Since repeat offenders often commit crimes in the same areas they did before, it is a preventative strategy to engage those offenders if they are seen in areas where they commonly commit crimes. That is, police presence and police-public conversations may deter crime. Crime is often committed when the risk of being caught is lower than the reward, as outlined in deterrence theory. Therefore, police interactions and presence would heighten criminals’ risk of being caught, and thereby crime may be deterred. Moreover, police may document if a repeat offender is observed in an area where they are frequently offending in. This documentation often assists in future investigations (e.g., documented clothing that may be seen later on video footage).

Street Checking Repeat Offenders: VPD Data
An examination of the VPD data illustrates that many of the street checks VPD officers conduct are those of individuals who have been suspects in previous police criminal investigations (this includes individuals who were suspects, chargeable, or charged in criminal investigation). Our classification of a suspect includes all Statistics Canada Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) categories where a person may be coded as role type suspect or charged. The PRIME-BC municipal bylaw or violation ticket system was not queried for this examination. Rather, examples of offences encompassed in this data include assaults, sex offences, robbery, and break and enters.

Of all street checked individuals in 2017, 80% had previously been suspects in police criminal investigations by police departments in Metro Vancouver (i.e., they were a suspect before the VPD did the 2017 street check). More specifically, the VPD has conducted street checks on individuals who, on average, were suspects in 22 criminal police investigations (before the 2017 street check occurred). This lends support to the position that VPD officers base street checks on observed unusual, suspicious, or potentially criminal behaviour.

---

9 A named subject for whom grounds exists to support the recommendation of a charge were criminal offences exist, but alternative measures are offered.
The ethnicity data of these 80% reveals that:

- 89% of Indigenous Peoples that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 29 separate criminal investigations per person);

- 84% of Caucasians that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 23 separate criminal investigations per person);

- 83% of Black persons that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 26 separate criminal investigations per person);

- 82% of Middle Eastern persons that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 16 separate criminal investigations per person);

- 81% of Hispanic persons that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 13 separate criminal investigations per person);

- 81% of South Asians that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 14 separate criminal investigations per person); and

- 74% of Asians that were street checked in 2017 were suspects in previous criminal investigations (an average of 14 separate criminal investigations per person).

Conviction data was also examined, as individuals are convicted through objective judicial proceedings. Of all the unique individuals street checked in 2017, 44% were convicted of at least one criminal offence, in a criminal incident that pre-dated the 2017 street check. Collectively, this data suggests that the VPD’s use of street check is not random targeting, but based on a totality of suspicious circumstances and behaviours.

**Case Study**

VPD patrol officers conducted a street check of a male they suspected was involved in property crime offences. During the street check, the officers noted the specific clothing worn by the individual. Two separate break and enters at two businesses occurred the day before and the day after the street check. Surveillance footage showed that the suspect wore the exact same clothing as the individual from the street check.

Detectives were able to identify the male as a suspect based on the clothing detail in the street check and laid charges of Break and Enter. The suspect was later convicted.
Locations of VPD Street Checks: Crime Hot Spots

An important facet in the detection and prevention of crime is that it is often concentrated in clusters of areas, often referred to as hotspots. One of the first studies to examine crime hotspots found that 50% of CFS were “dispatched to just over 3% of all addresses and street sections”. Similar findings have been reported in other cities, including Vancouver. Therefore, proactive police strategies, which may include street checks, are often focused on certain areas.

VPD Crime Analysts work to identify crime hot spots. The analysis focuses on the geo-temporal distribution of crime incidents that are inconsistent with previous known patterns for the area and time of year. Other factors, such as modus operandi and repeat victimization precedents are considered in the analysis process to identify a discernable pattern, which then helps to narrow a list of chronic offenders that meet the criminogenic criteria and are viable suspects. Police are then watchful for these individuals entering the predefined area during the specific times and days that correspond to the offender’s criminal activity cycle.

Of note, there lies a distinction between identifying certain areas, as described above, versus identifying certain people based on ethnicities, or any demographic factor. The VPD identifies crime areas; certain areas may have ethnic clusters as well. For example, Vancouver’s DTES is a high-crime area that presents challenges for police and the community, due to its high levels of poverty, homelessness, drug use, mental health issues, amongst other issues. The DTES also has a larger proportion of Indigenous Peoples than the city as a whole.

Correlation between the Location of Street Checks and the Location of CFS

All CFS that the VPD responded to from 2008 to 2017 were mapped and displayed with density maps, a graphical representation to display where concentrations of CFS are located. Similarly, all VPD street checks from the ten years of data were mapped using identical criteria and shown where the highest density of street checks occur. While CFS and street checks occur everywhere in Vancouver, only the higher concentrations appear on the map ranging from frequent (green) to the highest frequency (red).
A side-by-side visual comparison of the two density maps show a clear and similar pattern between CFS and street checks. To test this similarity and the relationship between the two density maps, a correlation analysis was conducted. A correlation coefficient (score) ranges from -1 to 1; a score closer to -1 means as one measure increases the other measure decreases—that is, an inverse relationship. On the contrary, a score closer to 1 means as one measure increases the other measure increases. A correlation coefficient closer to zero
suggests that there is no reciprocal pattern when one measure moves. Of note, correlations are used to describe data and show relationships; however, they are not used to indicate whether one measurement caused the other. That is, correlation does not imply causation.

The correlation analysis of the two density maps confirmed the visual similarity and showed a strong positive relationship \((r = 0.8746)\) between the locations where street checks and CFS occur. That is, the areas with the most CFS were the areas with the most street checks.

Correlation between the Location of Street Checks and the Location of Violent Crime

To understand the types of crime that are associated with street checks, we examined serious offences. Specifically, incidents of Violent Crime (e.g., Assaults, Robbery, Sexual Offences, and Attempt Murder, etc.), for the 10 year period of 2008 to 2017, were plotted on the density map to assess their relation to the location of street checks.

![Figure 3. Density Map of Violent Crime (2008-2017)](image)

Again, a visual comparison of the density maps illustrates that Violent Crime distribution appears similar to that of street checks. To test this visual, a correlation analysis confirmed the similarity and showed an even stronger positive relationship \((r = 0.9131)\) between the locations where street checks and violence occur. That is, the areas with the most violence were the areas with the most street checks; this illustrates the VPD’s deliberate non-random use of street checks in areas with serious crime.

The density maps and analyses illustrate that the high call areas and the areas with the most violence are where the police are the most proactive and conduct the most street checks. As supported by theory and research, proactive work is important to establish a visual deterrent as well as to gather sufficient information to identify suspects, if crimes in the area are later committed.
The VPD’s crime prevention programs are developed in problem areas and the use of street checks is one tool to support these programs. The data illustrates that the VPD’s use of street checks is not random, but a component of proactive enforcement efforts. That is, street checks are occurring in areas of Vancouver where workload for officers is the highest or in the areas that are the most violent. This supports the premise that when officers conduct street checks, they occur in areas of Vancouver that would warrant it.

Limitations of Data
There are certain methodological characteristics that may have influenced the interpretation of select research findings in this document. These constraints are important to understanding the strength of associated data.

Validity Issues in Data
Unfortunately, research efforts to separate the various drivers of racial disparity in police data are often spoiled by well-known data quality and data availability issues. First, not all street-level interactions are captured in the form of an official street check. Even when a street check record is created in police databases, it does not always explicitly capture all the demographic, social, and professional information related to the people involved; where and when the stop occurred; the specific reasons for the stop; what took place during the stop; why the action took place; how long the street check took; and what the ultimate outcome of the check was. As generally is the case with police data, it is collected for public safety reasons and may not specifically align with FOI or media requested information.

Designed with the goal of investigative and record keeping, the provincially mandated PRIME-BC system along with other police databases, were not intended for accurate data extraction for analysis, release, nor reporting. In alignment with the systems purpose, officers do not record data or write police reports with the objective of generating extractable and analyzable statistics. An illustration of this is presented (in a following section) on the limitations of VPD data on well-being street checks.

Data examined in this review are of statistics that are recorded, by a certain officer at that time. The same individual street checked at a different time may be represented as a different ethnicity. Therefore, the data represents the ethnicity that the officer perceived or entered at that time. When reviewing unique individuals/events in PRIME-BC, multiple ethnicities may be available for one person. Within the submitted data, variables like ethnicity, race, and skin colour are usually conflated and are rarely validated or audited for reliability, completeness, or compliance.

Research Assumptions
In situations where no system link exists between two sets of data or the system has no indicators of a desired measure, analytical assumptions need to be made. For example, when determining how many citizens’ CFS lead to a street check, assumptions were made based on a matching system as CFS and street checks are recorded in two separate databases. Specifically, matching of addresses, date, submitting officer(s), and other naming variables were used.
Duplications & Repeat Street Checks
Due to system errors, there are duplications in the data. The system does not identify when the same instance has been submitted multiple times. It is important to note that duplication may lead to inflation of data, and this should be considered in the interpretation of results. It is also important to note the distinction between street check interactions and individuals; for example, in 2017 there were 6,322 street check interactions, but 4,130 unique individuals. This is relevant because ethnicity data is reflected in interactions, and not individuals; as such, this is important to note in the interpretation of data.

The Issue of Street Checks in British Columbia
Provincial Police Services Division
Currently, the B.C. Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General does not have a policy or Provincial Standard governing the use of street checks. However, in response to recommendations from the MWCI, and taking into consideration the findings of other inquiries and review processes across Canada, B.C. is developing new policing standards to promote overall equality in the delivery of policing services throughout the province. To effectively develop these standards, the Province undertook a public consultation process to garner a deeper understanding regarding the public’s views on equitable or unbiased policing.180 Albeit the consultation was not intended directly for street checks, it is anticipated that one of the new standards will be regarding street checks.

The public consultation process involved an online questionnaire asking respondents about their level of agreement on a range of concepts and potential principles relating to unbiased policing. These concepts and potential principles were developed from an examination of related materials from other jurisdictions and from discussions with stakeholders and community organizations.

More than 200 British Columbians, from a balanced and diverse demographic, participated in the online questionnaire, providing their concerns, recommendations and general support for the concept and themes proposed for the new B.C. Provincial Policing Standards. Respondents could also offer comments and suggestions about the information presented and what they would like to see added. In addition, written submissions were received from interested organizations.

Out of the 231 questionnaires completed online, 179 respondents wrote additional, detailed comments on at least one question. Comments included constructive feedback, concerns, and recommendations for the development and implementation of Provincial Policing Standards to promote unbiased policing. Overall, most respondents supported the proposed concepts and themes that may be part of Principles for Provincial Policing Standards on the promotion of unbiased policing.

Aside from the originally proposed concepts and themes, an additional theme was examined as some stakeholders expressed an interest in standards for street checks. Over half of the participants (55%) strongly agreed or agreed that this theme is important for the B.C. Provincial Policing Standards to promote unbiased policing, but over a quarter of the participants (28%) strongly disagreed or disagreed. Although some respondents were against the police use of street checks, citing the potential for abuse of power among other concerns, “many supported police use of street checks, emphasizing their utility in ensuring
the safety of the community, preventing and solving crime, as a tool for finding or monitoring individuals, [and as] a key part of proactive policing." In other words, respondent(s) stated, “victims of crimes expect that police will conduct street checks to prevent crimes and/or identify suspect(s).”

Moreover, there were some suggestions that comprehensive training and education would be necessary to prevent street checks from unfairly targeting specific groups of individuals. Additionally, to support police officers and protect British Columbians, many respondents suggested that there should be clear, fair, and consistent street check guidelines in place; there should be oversight to ensure compliance with these guidelines; and, that these guidelines should be made public. However, there were concerns that standardizing street checks would limit the capabilities of police officers to prevent crime and identify suspects.

Many supported police use of street checks, emphasizing their utility in ensuring the safety of the community, preventing and solving crime, as a tool for finding or monitoring individuals...street checks are a key part of proactive policing...victims of crimes expect that police will conduct street checks to prevent crimes and/or identify suspect(s)

A Collective Position
Police chiefs in British Columbia are represented by two associations, the first being the British Columbia Association of Municipal Chiefs of Police (BCAMCP) and the British Columbia Association of Chiefs of Police (BCACP). The BCAMCP represents the municipal police chiefs, whereas the BCACP represents the chiefs of police for both the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and municipal police agencies in B.C. The purpose of these associations is to promote uniformity in police practices and efficient practices in preventing/detecting crime, while ensuring high standard of ethics, integrity, and conduct.

The BCACP supports consistency in the delivery of lawful and bias-free policing strategies, including the use of street checks. The BCACP and BCAMCP agree that street checks are not random but done within the authorities provided by common law and the B.C. Police Act, originating either as proactive initiatives or from citizens’ CFS.

Future Directions
The VPD is committed to ensuring that our police practices and crime prevention strategies are applied judiciously and do not infringe on citizen rights. The VPD will continue to work on initiatives that support this commitment, as described below.

VPD Street Check Policy
The VPD has continued to improve its street check standards over the past two years, and has made modifications based on the changing landscape that has taken place across Canada. In April of this year, the Government of B.C. advised that they will also be developing provincial standards on street checks. It is expected that this provincial standard will help
provide a framework for street check policies for police in B.C. We will formalize our street check standards into policy and ensure that it is compliant with any future provincial standards.

**Continued Education**

In line with ensuring that VPD officers are conducting street checks appropriately, the VPD is committed to ongoing training initiatives for all frontline staff. The VPD has developed refresher sessions on street checks for all frontline officers. The lessons guide officers through the legal framework that members of the VPD may operate within when interacting with citizens. Officers are trained on their legal authorities and that street checks may not be based on prohibited grounds as set out in the B.C. *Human Rights Code*.

**Publishing Data Annually**

In an effort to continue to strengthen public trust, confidence and transparency, the VPD commits to releasing data on street checks annually.

**Providing More Information**

Communicating with the communities that the VPD serves is important for fostering trust and building positive relationships. With these considerations, the VPD plans to raise awareness of street checks through a new public education initiative. The VPD will provide information on what street checks are, and why and how they are used by police.

**Expansion of the Indigenous Liaison Role**

The VPD has recently developed a new Indigenous Liaison Protocol Officer position. This officer will be based out of the Vancouver Aboriginal Community Policing Centre and will work directly with the Indigenous community to develop both VPD and community programming, act as a resource for VPD members on Indigenous culture, as well as coordinate a VPD Indigenous Advisory Committee. In addition to these duties, the Indigenous Liaison Protocol Officer will be a dedicated point of contact for community members to raise any concerns they may have about street checks or if they feel they have been targeted because of their ethnicity.

**Check Well-Being Reason Code**

Currently, the VPD is working with PRIMECorp, the organization that manages PRIME-BC, to develop a “reason code” (category) that would be appropriate for instances where VPD officers are not investigating or preventing crime, but rather are interacting with citizens to ensure their health, safety, and well-being. These include instances when VPD officers provide assistance with housing, ensure that vulnerable individuals are not at risk during freezing cold temperatures, and other situations such as these. With the development of a specific reason code, the VPD will be able to quantify the frequency of well-being checks with more accuracy.
Conclusion

The VPD is dedicated to ensuring that the rights of citizens are respected. Therefore, VPD members will not stop, question or detain any person for a reason based on prohibited grounds of discrimination, or engage in "racial profiling". The VPD does not support random or arbitrary stops of any individual in order to collect personal information. Nor does the VPD support random street checks. The VPD does not support any police action based on discriminatory profiling.

As illustrated clearly in the data, street checks have various functions including as a proactive crime reduction strategy, as well as responding to concerned citizens. This empirical review illustrated that VPD’s street checks are conducted in targeted hotspots—areas with the most violence, and areas where most calls from citizens are received. That is, street checks are conducted in deliberate areas, in line with our crime reduction strategies that target crime hotspots. Furthermore, the data revealed that the large majority of individuals that are street checked are those with known criminality.

The VPD utilizes a myriad of techniques that detect and prevent crime; this includes using strategies to deter those individuals who are known to be involved in criminal acts. The VPD is committed to making Vancouver a safe place for all. Ensuring safety includes taking care of those that are most vulnerable.

The VPD’s priority has been—and always will be—protecting all citizens of Vancouver.
This list below of abbreviations/acronyms is compiled from terminology that is used throughout this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary of Abbreviations/Acronyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAMCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIME-BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A: Ethnicity and Victimization

### Ethnicity of Victims of Violent Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity of Victims of Property Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity of Victims of Total Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

h Please note that “Van. Pop.” refers to Vancouver population based on 2016 Census data.
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# Appendix B: Gender and Victimization

## Gender of Victims of Violent Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td><strong>40.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td><strong>59.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gender of Victims of Property Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td><strong>44.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td><strong>55.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gender of Victims of Total Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td><strong>44.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td><strong>55.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Ethnicity of Offenders

#### Ethnicity of Violent Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity of Property Crime Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity of Offenders for Total Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIGENOUS</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ASIAN</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Gender of Offenders

### Gender of Violent Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender of Property Crime Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender of Offenders for Total Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endnotes

15 R. v. Poole, 2015 BCCA 464
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