Service Evaluations for Lethbridge Police Service Lethbridge Public Opinion Study – Winter 2017

© 2017 Lethbridge College



faron.ellis@lethbridgecollege.ca www.lethbridgecollege.ca/go/csrl

Lethbridge College 3000 College Drive South Lethbridge AB T1K 1L6



Contents

Methodology	2
0 ,	
Executive Summary	3
Fusionations of Lathbridge Police Comics	_
Evaluations of Lethbridge Police Service	5
Overall Performance Evaluation	5
Meeting Expectations	7
Changes in Meeting Expectations	
Attitudes and Behavior of LPS Officers	
Direct Contact with LPS Officer	
Community Safety	
Neighborhood Safety	15
Changes in Perception of Neighborhood Safety	17
Reasons for Change in Perception of Neighborhood Safety	
Downtown Safety	ZI
Frequency of Visits to Downtown Core	23
Priorities for Policing Resources	25
Thornes for Following Recoduleds	20
Demographics	28
Domographics	
Question Wording	28



Methodology

Population The city of Lethbridge has a total population of 96,828 residents (2016 census) approximately 80% of which are 18 years of age or older (77,500). A total of 47,457 Lethbridge residents are male (49%) while 49,371 are female (51%). South Lethbridge is home to 31,720 residents (32.8%) while the rapidly expanding west side is now home to 37,929 residents (39.2%). There are 27,179 north Lethbridge residents (28.1%).

Sample Data Collected by Lethbridge College students in 11 courses enrolled in a variety of Lethbridge College programs in the winter of 2017. Students interviewed 1,501 randomly selected adult Lethbridge residents by telephone on February 11-16, 2017 under the supervision of CSRL Research Chair, Faron Ellis. We sincerely appreciate and thank all those who took time to respond to our survey. Full methodological notes and results from previous Lethbridge and Alberta Public Opinion Studies can be accessed by visiting the CSRL web pages at: www.lethbridgecollege.ab.ca/go/csrl.

Representativeness Analysis of the demographic data indicates that, within acceptable limits, the sample accurately represents the demographic distribution of the adult population within the city of Lethbridge. The sample has been statistically weighted to even better reflect that of the population (sex, age, and area of the city of Lethbridge).

Confidence The sample yields a margin of error of \pm 2.5 percentage points, 19 times out of 20. The margin of error increases when analyzing subsamples of the data.

IB Commons Call Centre The CSRL operates as a division of the Centre for Applied Arts and Sciences. Students conducted interviews using the facilities of the Lethbridge College IB Commons Call Centre, drawing on support from the Lethbridge College Facility Management, Instructional Technology, Audio Visual, and the Centre for Applied Research and Innovation.

Sponsorship These data are part of a larger study of the attitudes and opinions of Lethbridge residents conducted by the Citizen Society Research Lab at Lethbridge College. Lethbridge Police Service sponsored this particular set of questions. We thank LPS for their ongoing support of our research endeavors.



Executive Summary

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service

Overall Performance Evaluation

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (73.4%) believe Lethbridge Police Service is doing a good job policing their community, a noticeable increase from the 63.7% who thought similarly in 2006. Very few Lethbridge residents (5.7%) believe LPS is doing a poor job, while approximately one-fifth (20.9%) say the police are performing adequately. Large majorities within all demographic groups provide Lethbridge Police Service with very positive evaluations.

Meeting Expectations

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (69.0%) believes LPS is doing a good job meeting residents' expectations about what a police service should be doing. Less than one in twenty Lethbridge residents (4.0%) believe LPS is doing a poor job meeting expectations while the remaining 27.2% believe LPS to be adequately meeting residents' expectations.

Changes in Meeting Expectations

Most Lethbridge residents (73.8%) believe LPS has neither improved nor worsened in meeting expectations in the past year. Of those who believe LPS has changed in meeting expectations, nearly four times more Lethbridge residents believe LPS has improved (15.9%) than believe LPS has gotten worse (4.3%).

Attitudes and Behavior of LPS Officers

The vast majority of Lethbridge residents (91.2%) believe LPS officers are polite and respectful. Only 8.8% of Lethbridge residents believe LPS officers are impolite and disrespectful (6.9% somewhat so while only 1.9% believe LPS officers to be very impolite and disrespectful.)

Direct Contact with LPS Officer in Past Year

Exactly half of all Lethbridge residents (50.0%) had some direct contact with a LPS officer over the past year. Younger Lethbridge residents (61.9%) are much more likely to have contact with LPS officers than are seniors (36.2%).

Community Safety

Neighborhood Safety

For the most part, Lethbridge residents feel very safe in their neighborhoods. A majority of Lethbridge residents (52.9%) feels very safe in their neighborhoods and a further 40.3% feel somewhat safe. Very few feel somewhat unsafe (6.1%) and fewer still (0.7%) feel very unsafe in their neighborhoods.

Changes in Perception of Neighborhood Safety

A large majority of Lethbridge residents (72.3%) feel just as safe in their neighborhood this year as they did one year ago. Slightly more Lethbridge residents feel less safe (15.9%) than those who feel safer (11.8%) this year compared to last year. Women (20.8%) are twice as likely as are men (10.8%) to feel less safe in their neighborhoods this year.



Executive Summary (continued)

Community Safety (continued)

Reasons for Feeling Less Safe in Neighborhood

Of the 15.9% who feel less safe in their neighborhoods this year compared to one year ago, a substantial plurality (38.2%) stated that property crimes were the main reason they feel less safe. A further 16.2% said violent crime was their main concern (only 2.5% of the total respondents surveyed.) Approximately one in ten cited societal changes, drugs, or undesirable people in their neighborhoods as the main reason for feeling less safe. A further 7.4% referred to general problems specific to their neighborhood while only 6.4% (1% of the total respondents) cited police problems for their declining feelings of safety in their neighborhoods.

Downtown Safety

Overall, Lethbridge residents feel safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge, although less safe than they feel in their own neighborhoods. A majority of Lethbridge residents feel somewhat safe (53.2%) when visiting downtown Lethbridge, while just under one-quarter (23.1%) feel very safe downtown. Less than one-quarter of Lethbridge residents do not feel safe downtown, with most of those (18.9%) feeling somewhat unsafe. Only a very small number (4.8%) feel very unsafe while visiting downtown.

Frequency of Visits to Downtown Lethbridge

Most Lethbridge residents frequent downtown on a regular basis. Less than one in six Lethbridge residents (16.1%) go downtown daily, and less than half (42.1%) visit downtown on a weekly basis. One-quarter of Lethbridge residents (25.9%) visit downtown at least monthly, while 9.9% go downtown only a few times per year. Approximately one in twenty Lethbridge residents (6.0%) report that they rarely or never go downtown.

Policing Priorities

When asked to prioritize from a list of four activities that Lethbridge Police Service could devote greater time and resources to, a clear consensus emerged with crime prevention topping the list for respondents' first (and second) priorities. Drug enforcement followed as the second most important area to which resident would prefer LPS to devote more time and resources. Community visibly emerged as the third most prioritized area, while traffic enforcement came in fourth. Less than one in twenty respondents offered their own suggestions beyond the four listed.



Overall Performance Evaluation

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (73.4%) believe Lethbridge Police Service is doing a good job policing their community, a noticeable increase from the 63.7% who thought similarly in 2006. Very few Lethbridge residents (5.7%) believe LPS is doing a poor job, while approximately one-fifth (20.9%) say the police are performing adequately.

Substantial majorities within all demographic groups evaluate Lethbridge Police Service positively. Women (76.4%), university graduates (83.7%), seniors (77.1%), and upper income residents (76.7%) are most positive. Men (70.2%), lower income earners (70.5), less educated residents, and the youth (65.6%) are less positive, although still much more positive than negative.

Residents who had direct personal contact with a LPS officer in the past year are just as likely (73.4%) as are those who had no contact (73.5%) to believe the police are doing a good job.

	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Good	63.7	64.1	69.9	70.5	70.3	67.4	69.5	72.7	72.0	73.4
Adequate	27.7	28.7	24.5	23.6	25.6	29.0	25.1	21.7	24.4	20.9
Poor	8.6	7.2	5.6	5.9	4.1	3.6	5.4	5.6	3.6	5.7
	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Very good	19.9	23.7	17.3	21.1	30.7	22.1	28.1	30.9	30.5	30.7
Good	43.8	40.4	52.6	49.4	39.6	45.3	41.4	41.8	41.5	42.7
Adequate	27.7	28.7	24.5	23.6	25.6	29.0	25.1	21.7	24.4	20.9
Poor	6.1	5.5	3.4	4.6	3.0	2.7	4.1	4.6	2.6	3.4
Very Poor	2.5	1.7	2.2	1.4	1.1	0.9	1.3	1.0	1.0	2.3



Lethbridge Police Service Performance (February 2017) (%)

Gender*	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Good	70.2	76.4	73.4	
Adequate	23.6	18.4	20.9	
Poor	6.2	5.1	5.7	
Contact in past year	Yes	No		
Good	73.4	73.5		
Adequate	19.7	21.9		
Poor	6.9	4.6		
Area	South	North	West	
Good	73.6	74.1	72.6	
Adequate	20.3	19.3	22.6	
Poor	6.1	6.6	4.8	
Household Income*	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Good	70.5	75.2	76.7	
Adequate	21.6	19.9	19.0	
Poor	8.0	4.9	4.3	
Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Good	69.2	68.8	70.0	83.7
Adequate	21.4	24.2	23.3	15.1
Poor	9.4	7.0	6.7	1.2
Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Good	65.6	75.2	76.8	77.1
Adequate	24.7	21.1	18.6	19.2
Poor	9.7	3.7	4.6	3.7
Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less	

74.5

20.8

4.7

72.6

20.7

6.7

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

73.3

21.6

5.2

Good

Poor

Adequate



Meeting Expectations

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (69.0%) believes LPS is doing a good job meeting residents' expectations about what a police service should be doing. Less than one in twenty Lethbridge residents (4.0%) believe LPS is doing a poor job meeting expectations while the remaining 27.0% believe LPS to be adequately meeting residents' expectations.

Very few demographic differences are measures when considering whether LPS is meeting residents' expectations. Only education and frequency of visits downtown significantly impact opinion, with university graduates (80.2%) most likely to say LPS is meeting their expectations, compared to only 60.8% of those with the least amount of education who thought similarly. In addition, those who frequent downtown Lethbridge on a weekly basis (73.7%) and daily (69.7%) are more likely to think LPS is meeting their expectations than are those who frequent downtown monthly or less (64.1%).

Lethbridge residents who had direct contact with an LPS officer in the past year are just as likely to believe LPS is meeting residents' expectations (69.1%) as are those who did not have LSP contact (68.8%).

	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Good	64.3	58.3	65.4	67.0	68.6	63.3	68.1	70.5	67.7	69.0
Adequate	30.2	35.0	29.6	26.7	27.8	32.1	28.2	24.5	28.2	27.0
Poor	5.6	6.7	5.0	6.3	3.6	4.6	3.7	5.0	4.1	4.0

	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Very good	15.9	14.8	14.5	15.5	22.7	17.3	23.9	22.3	24.9	22.2
Good	48.4	43.5	50.9	51.6	45.9	46.0	44.2	48.2	42.8	46.8
Adequate	30.2	35.0	29.6	26.7	27.8	32.1	28.2	24.5	28.2	27.0
Poor	3.6	5.5	4.3	4.6	3.0	4.0	1.8	4.3	2.8	2.9
Very Poor	2.0	1.2	0.7	1.7	0.5	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.3	1.1



Meeting Expectations (February 2017) (%)

Gender	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Good	67.3	70.7	69.0	
Adequate	28.4	25.8	27.0	
Poor	4.3	3.6	4.0	
Contact in past year	Yes	No		
Good	69.1	68.8		
Adequate	25.6	28.4		
Poor	5.3	2.8		
Area	South	North	West	
Good	70.9	66.2	69.5	
Adequate	25.7	28.0	27.3	
Poor	3.3	5.8	3.1	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Good	67.3	68.5	72.7	
Adequate	28.8	26.9	24.7	
Poor	3.9	4.7	2.6	
Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Good	60.8	67.2	64.2	80.2
Adequate	34.0	28.5	30.0	18.6
Poor	5.2	4.3	5.8	1.2
Age	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Good	66.3	74.3	67.3	70.7
Adequate	29.5	22.4	28.4	26.2
Poor	4.2	3.3	4.3	3.1

Weekly

73.7

23.1

3.2

Monthly or less

64.1

31.7

4.2

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Daily

69.7

24.8

5.6

Visits Downtown*

Good

Adequate Poor



Changes in Meeting Expectations

Most Lethbridge residents (79.8%) believe LPS has neither improved nor worsened in meeting expectations in the past year. Of those who believe LPS has changed in meeting expectations, nearly four times more Lethbridge residents believe LPS has improved (15.9%) than believe LPS has gotten worse (4.3%).

Few differences in opinion are measured between different demographic groups, although lower income residents (20.3%) are significantly more likely than are other income groups to believe LPS has improved in meeting residents' expectations about what a police service should be doing. Women (17.9%) are also slightly more likely than are men (13.7%) to believe LPS has improved in meeting their exceptions.

Lethbridge residents who had direct contact with an LPS officer in the past year are slightly more likely to believe LPS to have improved in meeting expectations (17.9%) than are those who had no contact (13.8%).

	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Improved	24.3	17.4	18.2	16.0	16.0	17.0	16.8	17.0	19.5	15.9
Stayed Same	71.9	77.2	78.4	79.9	80.5	77.0	75.9	78.1	76.8	79.8
Worsened	3.7	5.4	3.4	4.1	3.5	6.0	7.3	4.9	3.8	4.3



65 and older

19.6

76.5

4.0

Changes in Meeting Expectations (February 2017) (%)

Gender*	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Improved	13.7	17.9	15.9	
Stayed the same	81.2	78.5	79.8	
Worsened	5.1	3.6	4.3	
Contact in past year	Yes	No		
Improved	17.9	13.8		
Stayed the same	76.6	83.1		
Worsened	5.5	3.1		
Area	South	North	West	
Improved	16.0	20.0	12.6	
Stayed the same	78.4	76.2	83.7	
Worsened	5.6	3.8	3.6	
Household Income*	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Improved	20.3	16.4	11.9	
Stayed the same	75.3	79.7	84.7	
Worsened	4.4	3.9	3.4	
Education	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Improved	20.7	17.9	12.6	14.2
Stayed the same	73.4	77.9	82.0	83.7
Worsened	5.8	4.2	5.3	2.0

30-44

11.1

87.2

1.6

45-64

12.5

83.0

4.5

Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less
Improved	17.9	15.1	15.4
Stayed the same	76.1	81.5	80.0
Worsened	6.0	3.4	4.6

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

18-29

18.6

75.7

5.8

Age

Improved

Worsened

Stayed the same



Attitudes and Behavior of LPS Officers

The vast majority of Lethbridge residents (91.2%) believe LPS officers are polite and respectful. Only 8.8% of Lethbridge residents believe LPS officers are impolite and disrespectful (6.9% somewhat so, while only 1.9% believe LPS officers to be very impolite and disrespectful.)

All demographic groups within the city of Lethbridge agree by overwhelming majorities that LPS officers are polite and respectful. Statistically significant differences are measured within only two demographic categories. University graduates (94.3%) and seniors (93.8%) are more likely to rate LPS officers as polite and respectful than are the youth (86.7%) and those with less education.

Nine out of every ten Lethbridge residents who had direct contact with an LPS officer believe officers to be polite and respectful (89.9%), only slightly fewer than those who did not have contact (92.7%), but these differences are not statistically significant.

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Polite & respectful	89.2	89.9	88.4	87.5	85.6	88.5	91.5	91.2
Impolite & disrespectful	10.8	10.1	11.6	12.5	14.4	11.5	8.5	8.8

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Very polite & respectful	40.8	40.0	43.4	38.5	37.0	40.4	47.5	45.5
Somewhat polite & respectful	48.4	50.0	45.0	49.0	48.6	48.1	44.0	45.7
Somewhat impolite & disrespectful	8.1	7.5	9.1	10.5	9.4	9.8	6.1	6.9
Very impolite & disrespectful	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.0	5.0	1.7	2.4	1.9



Attitudes and Behavior (February 2017) (%)

Gender	Male	Female	Lethbridge
Polite and respectful	90.6	91.8	91.2
Impolite and disrespectful	9.4	8.2	8.8

Contact in past year	Yes	No
Polite and respectful	89.9	92.7
Impolite and disrespectful	10.1	7.3

Area	South	North	West
Polite and respectful	91.5	90.3	91.7
Impolite and disrespectful	8.5	9.7	8.3

Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000
Polite and respectful	89.8	91.8	90.6
Impolite and disrespectful	10.2	8.2	9.4

Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Polite and respectful	90.4	89.9	90.2	94.3
Impolite and disrespectful	9.6	10.1	9.8	5.7

_Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Polite and respectful	86.7	93.4	92.4	93.8
Impolite and disrespectful	13.3	6.6	7.6	6.3

Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less
Polite and respectful	91.3	92.0	90.4
Impolite and disrespectful	8.7	8.0	9.6



Lethbridge

Attitudes and Behavior (February 2017) (%)

Male

Gender

Gender	iviale	remale	Lembridge	
Very polite/respectful	42.7	47.8	45.5	
Somewhat polite/respectful	47.8	44.1	45.7	
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	7.5	6.3	6.9	
Very impolite/disrespectful	2.0	1.8	1.9	
Contact in past year	Yes	No		
Very polite/respectful	48.5	41.9		
Somewhat polite/respectful	41.4	50.8		
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	7.1	6.6		
Very impolite/disrespectful	3.0	0.7		
Area	South	North	West	
Very polite/respectful	45.7	46.5	44.5	
Somewhat polite/respectful	45.7	43.6	47.2	
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	6.7	7.2	6.9	
Very impolite/disrespectful	1.8	2.7	1.4	
ousehold Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Very polite/respectful	47.3	43.0	45.8	
Somewhat polite/respectful	42.5	48.8	44.7	
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	8.4	5.7	8.4	
Very impolite/disrespectful	1.8	2.5	1.1	
Education	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Very polite/respectful	44.2	43.8	43.1	50.7
Somewhat polite/respectful	45.8	46.3	47.2	43.6
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	7.1	9.0	6.2	4.8
Very impolite/disrespectful	2.9	0.8	3.5	0.9
Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Very polite/respectful	38.6	43.6	46.2	54.5
Somewhat polite/respectful	48.1	49.8	46.2	39.6
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	9.5	6.2	6.6	4.6
Very impolite/disrespectful	3.9	0.4	1.0	1.3
/isits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less	
Very polite/respectful	44.5	46.0	45.3	
Somewhat polite/respectful	46.4	46.0	45.1	
Somewhat impolite/disrespectful	8.1	6.9	6.5	
Very impolite/disrespectful	1.0	1.1	3.2	

Female



63.8

Direct Contact with LPS Officer in Past Year

Exactly half of all Lethbridge residents (50.0%) had some direct contact with a LPS officer over the past year.

Younger Lethbridge residents (61.9%) are much more likely to have contact with an LPS officer than are seniors (36.2%).

Interestingly, those most likely to frequent downtown Lethbridge are also most likely to have had direct contact with an LPS officer, clearly a reflection of LPS's efforts at being visible and interactive with downtown Lethbridge businesses, their employees and patrons.

50.7

Direct Contact with LPS Officer in the Past Year (February 2017)

38 1

Gender	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Yes	52.6	47.6	50.0	
No	47.4	52.4	50.0	
Area	South	North	West	
Yes	49.3	48.7	51.5	
No	50.7	51.3	48.5	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Yes	51.1	49.0	56.4	
No	48.9	51.0	43.6	
Education	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Yes	42.3	56.0	53.4	46.7
No	57.7	44.0	46.6	53.3
_Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Yes	61.9	58.7	49.3	36.2

413

110	00.1	11.0	00.1
Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less
Yes	54.9	54.3	44.3
No	45.1	45.7	55.7

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

No



Neighborhood Safety

For the most part, Lethbridge residents feel very safe in their neighborhoods. A majority (52.9%) feels very safe in their neighborhoods and a further 40.3% feel somewhat safe. Very few Lethbridge residents feel somewhat unsafe (6.1%) in their neighborhood and fewer still (0.7%) feel very unsafe in their neighborhoods.

Unlike in past years, Lethbridge women (47.7%) are significantly less likely to feel very safe in their neighborhoods than are men (58.6%).

University graduates (60.7%) and seniors (59.3%) are most likely to feel very safe in their neighborhoods. Younger (52.6%), lower income (50.5%), and north Lethbridge residents (46.3%) are somewhat less likely to feel very safe in their neighborhoods than are other residents, but the vast majority of all residents feel safe in their neighborhoods.

Residents who had contact with an LPS officer in the past year were just as likely to feel very safe (51.7%) or somewhat safe (39.8%) in their neighborhood as those who did not have contact (54.2% very safe and 41.0% somewhat safe.)

	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Very safe	60.7	49.8	59.9	54.2	62.1	59.0	61.8	60.9	58.4	52.9
Somewhat safe	32.2	42.9	36.2	41.4	34.9	35.8	30.7	33.8	34.9	40.3
Somewhat unsafe	4.9	6.6	3.5	3.5	2.3	4.6	6.4	3.7	5.2	6.1
Very unsafe	2.1	0.7	0.4	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.1	1.6	1.5	0.7



Evaluations of Neighborhood Safety (February 2017) (%)

Male

58.6

35.8

5.2

Gender*

Very safe Somewhat safe

Somewhat unsafe

Very unsafe	0.4	0.8	0.7	
Contact in past year	Yes	No		•
Very safe	51.7	54.2		
Somewhat safe	39.8	41.0		
Somewhat unsafe	7.7	4.3		
Very unsafe	0.8	0.6		
Area	South	North	West	
Very safe	54.4	46.3	56.7	
Somewhat safe	39.5	44.6	37.6	
Somewhat unsafe	6.0	7.6	4.9	
Very unsafe	0.0	1.4	0.7	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Very safe	50.5	52.0	56.7	
Somewhat safe	39.6	42.7	37.5	
Somewhat unsafe	8.2	5.1	5.5	
Very unsafe	1.6	0.2	0.3	
Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Very safe	53.1	49.8	47.5	60.7
Somewhat safe	38.0	42.8	43.7	36.2
Somewhat unsafe	6.6	7.0	8.2	2.9
Very unsafe	2.2	0.5	0.5	0.2
Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Very safe	52.6	45.9	52.6	59.8
Somewhat safe	34.6	48.8	41.8	36.3
Somewhat unsafe	11.4	4.5	5.1	3.3
Very unsafe	1.4	0.8	0.4	0.5
Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less	
Very safe	51.7	53.9	52.8	
Somewhat safe	41.9	40.7	39.0	
Somewhat unsafe	5.9	5.1	7.2	
Very unsafe	0.4	0.3	1.0	

Female

47.7

44.8

6.7

Lethbridge

52.9

40.3

6.1



Changes in Perception of Neighborhood Safety

A large majority of Lethbridge residents (72.3%) feel just as safe in their neighborhood this year as they did one year ago. Nevertheless, of those whose feelings of safety have changed, slightly more Lethbridge residents feel less safe (15.9%) than those who feel more safe (11.8%) this year compared to last year. Only 2.4% of Lethbridge residents feel much less safe in their neighborhoods this year, while 13.5% feel somewhat less safe. Conversely, 7.7% of Lethbridge residents feel somewhat safer this year, while 4.1% feel much safer.

Women (20.8%) are twice as likely as are men (10.8%) to feel less safe in their neighborhoods this year compared to last year. Only 3.4% of all women feel much less safe in their neighborhoods this year, while 17.2% feel somewhat less safe. This compares to only 1.1% of men who feel much less safe this year and slightly less than one in ten (9.6%) who feel somewhat less safe in their neighborhoods compared to a year ago.

Interestingly, all areas if the city report similar levels of changes in their feelings of safety in their neighborhoods. Only income and age significantly affect changes in feelings of neighborhood safety, with the youth (19.3%) twice as likely as all other age groups to feel more safe in their neighborhoods this year. Lower income earners (21.1%) are also much more likely than are other income groups to feel more safe in their neighborhoods this year. Upper income earners (18.3%) are slightly more likely than are other income groups to feel less safe in their neighborhoods this year compared to last year.

Change in Perceptions of Neighborhood Safety	Men	Women	All Residents		All Residents
Much more safe	4.4	3.4	4.1		
Somewhat more safe	7.7	7.7	7.7	More safe	11.8
No more or less safe	77.2	68.2	72.3	No more or less safe	72.3
Somewhat less safe	9.6	17.2	13.5	Less safe	15.9
Much less safe	1.1	3.4	2.4		



Changes in Perceptions of Neighborhood Safety (February 2017) (%)

Gender*	Male	Female	Lethbridge	_
More safe	12.1	11.1	11.8	
No more or less safe	77.2	68.1	72.3	
Less safe	10.8	20.8	15.9	
Contact in past year	Yes	No		
More safe	13.3	10.7		
No more or less safe	68.1	76.4		
Less safe	18.6	12.9		
Area	South	North	West	_
More safe	12.1	13.4	10.3	
No more or less safe	71.5	70.6	74.4	
Less safe	16.5	16.0	15.3	
Household Income*	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	_
More safe	21.6	11.1	5.2	
No more or less safe	62.7	74.4	76.5	
Less safe	15.7	14.5	18.3	
Education	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
More safe	14.4	15.3	10.0	8.5
No more or less safe	68.9	68.6	73.3	77.5
Less safe	16.7	16.1	16.7	14.0
Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
More safe	19.3	10.6	7.2	10.5
No more or less safe	66.1	69.8	77.9	73.4
Less safe	14.6	19.6	14.9	16.1
Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less	
More safe	12.9	11.8	11.2	
No more or less safe	67.9	74.9	71.7	
Less safe	19.2	13.3	17.2	



Reasons for Change in Perception of Neighborhood Safety

As noted above, a large majority of Lethbridge residents (72.3%) feel just as safe in their neighborhood this year as they did one year ago while 11.8% feel safer than they did last year.

Of the 15.9% who feel less safe, a substantial plurality (38.2%) stated that property crimes are the main reason they feel less safe in their neighborhood this year than they did one year earlier. A further 16.2% said violent crime is their main concern (only 2.5% of the total respondents surveyed.) Slightly more than one in ten (12.1%) cited societal changes of some kind – including problems associated with the economy, growth in the city of Lethbridge, or other societal factors – as the reason for their decreased feelings of neighborhood safety. A similar number (11.2%) referred to drugs (and often the crime associated with the drug trade) as the main reason they feel less safe this year. Less than one in ten (8.5%) mentioned undesirable people in their neighborhoods, often citing a large number of rental accommodations as the source. A further 7.4% referred to problems – other than property or violent crime, drugs, or general societal problems – that are specific to their neighborhood.

Only 6.4% (1% of the total respondents) cited policing issues for their declining feelings of safety in their neighborhoods.

Women are more likely to cite property (42.1%) and violent crime (18.6%) than are men (31.3% and 12.5% respectively) as the reason they feel less safe in their neighborhoods. Men (15.0%) are more likely than are women (9.3%) to cite drugs as their main concern.

West Lethbridge residents who feel less safe this year are more concerned about violent crime (24.7%) than are their south (16.3%) and north (6.3%) Lethbridge counterparts. North (14.1%) and south (12.5%) residents are more concerned about drugs than are west Lethbridge residents (7.4%).

Lower income residents (25.0%) are much more concerned about violent crime than are middle (16.9%) and upper income residents (11.9%). Lower income residents are less concerned about property crime (26.9%) than are residents with higher incomes.

Younger residents are much less concerned about drugs (5.3%) than are older residents, especially seniors (20.8%). However, the youth are more concerned about violent crime (22.1%) and are more likely to blame society generally (21.1%) than are older residents.

Reasons for Feeling Less Safe in Neighborhood	All residents	Residents who feel less safe (15.9% of total)
Property Crime	5.8	38.2
Violent Crime	2.5	16.2
Society/City (general/change/growth problems)	1.8	12.1
Drugs	1.7	11.2
Undesirable People - Rentals	1.3	8.5
General Neighborhood (problems)	1.1	7.4
Police Issues	1.0	6.4



Reasons for Feeling Less Safe in Neighborhood (February 2017) (%)

Gender*	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Property Crime	31.3	42.1	38.2	
Violent Crime	12.5	18.6	16.2	
Society/City	11.3	12.9	12.1	
Drugs	15.0	9.3	11.2	
Area	South	North	West	
Property Crime	40.0	39.1	35.8	
Violent Crime	16.3	6.3	24.7	
Society/City	7.5	17.2	12.3	
Drugs	12.5	14.1	7.4	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Property Crime	26.9	46.5	42.4	
Violent Crime	25.0	16.9	11.9	
Society/City	13.5	4.2	22.0	
Drugs	7.7	18.3	3.4	
Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Education* Property Crime	High School or less 30.2	Some Post-secondary 45.3	College-Tech-Trade 30.6	University Grad 43.4
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
Property Crime	30.2	45.3	30.6	43.4
Property Crime Violent Crime	30.2 9.3	45.3 17.2	30.6 16.1	43.4 20.8
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City	30.2 9.3 18.6	45.3 17.2 12.5	30.6 16.1 11.3	43.4 20.8 7.5
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age Property Crime	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29 36.8	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44 49.0	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64 35.5	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older 32.1
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age Property Crime Violent Crime	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29 36.8 22.8	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44 49.0 18.4	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64 35.5 11.3	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older 32.1 13.2
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29 36.8 22.8 21.1	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44 49.0 18.4 10.2	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64 35.5 11.3 9.7	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older 32.1 13.2 7.5
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Visits Downtown	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29 36.8 22.8 21.1 5.3	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44 49.0 18.4 10.2 10.2	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64 35.5 11.3 9.7 11.3	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older 32.1 13.2 7.5
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29 36.8 22.8 21.1 5.3	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44 49.0 18.4 10.2 10.2 Weekly	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64 35.5 11.3 9.7 11.3 Monthly or less	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older 32.1 13.2 7.5
Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Age Property Crime Violent Crime Society/City Drugs Visits Downtown Property Crime	30.2 9.3 18.6 11.6 18-29 36.8 22.8 21.1 5.3 Daily	45.3 17.2 12.5 6.3 30-44 49.0 18.4 10.2 10.2 Weekly	30.6 16.1 11.3 14.5 45-64 35.5 11.3 9.7 11.3 Monthly or less 35.7	43.4 20.8 7.5 13.2 65 and older 32.1 13.2 7.5



Downtown Safety

Overall, Lethbridge residents feel safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge, although less safe than they feel in their own neighborhoods. A majority of Lethbridge residents feel somewhat safe (53.2%) when visiting downtown Lethbridge, while just under one-quarter (23.1%) feel very safe downtown. Less than one-quarter of Lethbridge residents do not feel safe downtown, with most of those (18.9%) feeling somewhat unsafe. Only a very small number (4.8%) feel very unsafe while visiting downtown.

As was observed with respect to neighborhood safety, Lethbridge women feel less safe when visiting downtown than do Lethbridge men. Only 17.1% of women feel very safe when visiting downtown, compared to nearly three of every ten Lethbridge men (29.5%) who feel very safe when downtown.

As has been observed previously, younger residents (16.6%) are slightly less likely to feel very safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge than do other age groups, but younger residents are still much more likely to feel safe downtown than unsafe. Seniors are most likely to feel very safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge (28.7%).

Most of the differences in perceived levels of safety downtown parallel those found in perceptions of neighborhood safety. For example, the youth and lower income residents feel less safe in their own neighborhoods as well as downtown, indicating that socioeconomic factors are more likely to be at play here. Further, the data on the following page clearly indicate that those who frequent downtown most are also those who feel most safe downtown. Hence, while there may be a perception amongst some that downtown is less safe than other areas of the city, those opinions are most acute amongst socioeconomic groups who engage in activities that make them feel less safe more generally, and by those who do not frequent downtown very often. Clearly, residents who are most familiar with downtown are most likely to feel safe in that area of Lethbridge.

	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Very safe	24.1	23.2	25.1	30.7	29.5	23.1	25.4	22.4	23.8	23.1
Somewhat safe	54.9	53.1	53.6	52.4	53.8	55.6	54.4	53.9	53.5	53.2
Somewhat unsafe	16.9	19.6	18.1	15.0	14.9	18.9	15.6	19.8	18.9	18.9
Very unsafe	4.0	4.0	3.2	1.9	1.8	2.3	4.6	3.9	3.7	4.8



Evaluations of Downtown Safety (February 2017) (%)

Male

Gender*

Octioci	IVIGIO	1 Gillaic	Lottibriago	-
Very safe	29.5	17.1	23.1	
Somewhat safe	51.4	55.2	53.2	
Somewhat unsafe	15.4	22.0	18.9	
Very unsafe	3.8	5.7	4.8	
Contact in past year*	Yes	No		
Very safe	21.2	24.6		
Somewhat safe	52.9	53.8		
Somewhat unsafe	20.5	17.5		
Very unsafe	5.5	4.1		
Area	South	North	West	_
Very safe	26.4	22.0	21.0	
Somewhat safe	51.0	51.7	56.4	
Somewhat unsafe	18.4	20.3	18.2	
Very unsafe	4.2	5.9	4.5	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	_
Very safe	23.1	23.6	23.0	
Somewhat safe	53.5	51.9	56.3	
Somewhat unsafe	18.0	20.2	16.7	
Very unsafe	5.4	4.3	4.0	
Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Very safe	19.3	20.2	19.1	31.4
Somewhat safe	47.5	55.5	53.8	54.3
Somewhat unsafe	25.9	19.9	20.8	11.9
Very unsafe	7.3	4.3	6.3	2.5
Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Very safe	16.6	20.6	25.2	28.7
Somewhat safe	55.5	57.2	54.2	48.0
Somewhat unsafe	22.8	19.3	15.3	19.6
Very unsafe	5.1	2.9	5.3	3.8
Visits Downtown	Daily	Weekly	Monthly or less	
Very safe	26.6	27.3	17.2	
Somewhat safe	51.5	53.9	53.1	
Somewhat unsafe	17.5	15.7	22.9	
Very unsafe	4.4	3.1	6.8	

Female

Lethbridge



Frequency of Visits to Downtown Lethbridge

Most Lethbridge residents frequent downtown on a regular basis. Less than one in six Lethbridge residents (16.1%) go downtown daily, and less than half (42.1%) visit downtown on a weekly basis. One-quarter of Lethbridge residents (25.9%) visit downtown at least monthly, while one in ten (9.9%) go downtown only a few times per year. Approximately one in twenty Lethbridge residents (6.0%) report that they rarely or never go downtown.

Upper income earners, men, and middle aged and younger residents frequent downtown Lethbridge more often than do women, seniors or lower income earners.

				Let	hbridge					
	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Daily	23.6	19.9	20.4	15.9	18.9	18.5	18.0	20.2	17.1	16.1
Weekly	47.8	46.2	47.0	51.6	46.5	45.9	46.5	43.2	50.0	42.1
Monthly or less	28.7	33.8	32.6	32.4	34.6	35.5	35.6	36.7	32.9	41.8

				Let	hbridge					
	2006	2007	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Daily	23.6	19.9	20.4	15.9	18.9	18.5	18.0	20.2	17.1	16.1
Weekly	47.8	46.2	47.0	51.6	46.5	45.9	46.5	43.2	50.0	42.1
Monthly	17.4	19.3	21.3	19.7	22.1	23.3	25.2	25.6	21.1	25.9
Few times/year	4.8	7.3	6.3	7.1	6.0	9.0	6.7	6.1	7.6	9.9
Rarely or never	6.4	7.3	5.0	5.6	6.4	3.3	3.6	4.9	4.2	6.0



Frequency of Visits to Downtown Lethbridge (February 2017) (%)

Gender*	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Daily	17.8	14.5	16.1	
Weekly	44.8	39.5	42.1	
Monthly or less	37.4	46.0	41.8	
Contact in past year*	Yes	No		
Daily	17.7	14.7		
Weekly	45.3	38.5		
Monthly or less	37.0	46.8		
Area	South	North	West	
Daily	15.8	15.2	17.0	
Weekly	46.0	35.7	43.4	
Monthly or less	38.1	49.0	39.6	
Household Income*	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	
Daily	14.0	15.8	23.0	
Weekly	44.1	38.6	45.3	
Monthly or less	41.9	45.6	31.7	
Education*	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Daily	12.5	14.3	19.2	17.8
Weekly	36.2	45.7	35.3	48.8
Monthly or less	51.3	39.9	45.5	33.4
Age*	18-29	30-44	45-64	65 and older
Daily	13.9	22.4	18.4	11.2
Weekly	51.4	44.3	37.1	38.5
Monthly or less	34.7	33.3	44.5	50.3



Priorities or Policing Time and Resources

1st Priority

When asked to prioritize from a list of four activities to which LPS could devote greater time and resources, a clear consensus emerged with crime prevention (40.2%) topping the list. Drug enforcement (28.9%) followed as the second most important priority. Community visibly (16.8%) emerged as the third most important area while traffic enforcement (10.5%) came in fourth. Less than one in twenty-five respondents (3.6%) offered their own suggestions beyond the four that we listed.

No significant gender differences appear with approximately two of every five men (38.8%) and women (41.5%) choosing crime prevention as their top priority. Slightly less than three of every ten men (29.3%) and women (28.6%) prioritized drug enforcement.

Crime prevention and drug enforcement are the two top priorities in all areas of the city, with west Lethbridge residents most supportive of crime prevention (42.8%). South Lethbridge residents are slightly more interested in community visibility (19.8%) and traffic enforcement (13.0%) than are other residents, while north side residents are slightly more supportive of drug enforcement (31.4%) than are residents in other areas of the city.

No significant differences in priorities are measured between income groups, although lower income residents are slightly more likely to prioritize crime prevention (46.4%), while upper income residents are slightly more likely to prioritize drug enforcement (32.6%).

No significant differences are measured between income groups; however, it is worth noting that those with the least amount of formal education are the only demographic group to prioritize drug enforcement (36.3%) over crime prevention (31.7%).

Although all age groups prioritize crime prevention first and drug enforcement second, significant differences are evident with the youth most interested in crime prevention (48.7%) and considerably less interested in drug enforcement (24.4%) than are other age groups. Seniors, on the other hand, are slightly less interested in crime prevention (34.0%) and more interested in traffic enforcement (15.8%) than are other age groups. In fact, support for crime prevention decreases consistently as age increases.

No significant differences are measured based on frequency of visits to downtown Lethbridge, although those who frequent downtown the least are also the least interested in crime prevention and the most interested in drug enforcement.

1 st priority	2 nd priority
40.2	34.1
28.9	31.0
16.8	17.4
10.5	13.2
3.6	4.2
	40.2 28.9 16.8 10.5

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

2nd Priority

No significant demographic differences are measured on any of the second priority choices. Subgroup patterns are similar to those observed with first priorities, with crime prevention as the clear second priority only being supplemented by drug enforcement in demographic groups who had strongly endorsed crime prevention as their first priority.



1st Priority (February 2017) (%)

Gender	Male	Female	Lethbridge	
Crime Prevention	38.8	41.5	40.2	
Drug Enforcement	29.3	28.6	28.9	
Community Visibility	16.5	17.1	16.8	
Traffic Enforcement	11.5	9.5	10.5	
Some other activity	3.9	3.3	3.6	
Area*	South	North	West	_
Crime Prevention	38.7	38.7	42.8	
Drug Enforcement	26.0	31.4	29.5	
Community Visibility	19.8	16.2	14.4	
Traffic Enforcement	13.0	9.7	9.0	
Some other activity	2.6	4.0	4.3	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	_
Crime Prevention	46.4	38.1	38.3	
Drug Enforcement	23.4	28.2	32.6	
Community Visibility	15.7	17.0	19.1	
Traffic Enforcement	9.7	14.1	6.0	
Some other activity	4.8	2.7	4.0	
Education	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Crime Prevention	31.7	45.9	42.9	37.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement	31.7 36.3	45.9 24.5	42.9 28.0	37.8 29.2
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	31.7 36.3 14.1	45.9 24.5 16.5	42.9 28.0 16.9	37.8 29.2 18.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	31.7 36.3 14.1	45.9 24.5 16.5	42.9 28.0 16.9	37.8 29.2 18.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age*	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0 6.8	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9 5.4	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2 11.9	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0 15.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0 6.8 3.1	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9 5.4 2.9 Weekly	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2 11.9 3.5 Monthly or less	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0 15.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown Crime Prevention	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0 6.8 3.1 Daily	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9 5.4 2.9 Weekly 41.4	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2 11.9 3.5 Monthly or less 38.8	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0 15.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0 6.8 3.1 Daily 41.3 25.6	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9 5.4 2.9 Weekly 41.4 26.8	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2 11.9 3.5 Monthly or less 38.8 32.1	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0 15.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0 6.8 3.1 Daily 41.3 25.6 18.4	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9 5.4 2.9 Weekly 41.4 26.8 17.8	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2 11.9 3.5 Monthly or less 38.8 32.1 15.1	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0 15.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age* Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement	31.7 36.3 14.1 12.6 5.3 18-29 48.7 24.4 17.0 6.8 3.1 Daily 41.3 25.6	45.9 24.5 16.5 10.3 2.8 30-44 43.4 31.4 16.9 5.4 2.9 Weekly 41.4 26.8	42.9 28.0 16.9 8.8 3.4 45-64 36.9 29.4 18.2 11.9 3.5 Monthly or less 38.8 32.1	37.8 29.2 18.8 10.9 3.3 65 and older 34.0 30.5 15.0 15.8



2nd Priority (February 2017) (%)

Gender	Male	Female	Lethbridge	_
Crime Prevention	35.5	33.1	34.1	
Drug Enforcement	27.4	34.3	31.0	
Community Visibility	18.3	16.9	17.4	
Traffic Enforcement	13.3	12.9	13.2	
Some other activity	5.5	2.7	4.2	
Area	South	North	West	_
Crime Prevention	34.8	32.0	35.1	
Drug Enforcement	30.7	30.2	32.0	
Community Visibility	16.0	16.1	19.7	
Traffic Enforcement	13.6	17.6	9.5	
Some other activity	5.0	4.0	3.7	
Household Income	Under \$40,000	\$40,001 to \$100,000	Over \$100,000	_
Crime Prevention	30.1	33.7	38.3	
Drug Enforcement	36.4	28.5	30.7	
Community Visibility	13.2	19.9	17.6	
Traffic Enforcement	14.9	14.0	9.3	
Some other activity	5.4	3.9	4.1	
Education	TEST OST STATES	Cama Daat aaaaalam.	0 " T T	
Education	High School or less	Some Post-secondary	College-Tech-Trade	University Grad
Crime Prevention	35.1	31.5	32.5	37.6
	35.1 28.2	31.5 28.3	32.5 35.7	37.6 31.9
Crime Prevention	35.1 28.2 14.9	31.5 28.3 20.5	32.5 35.7 16.8	37.6 31.9 16.1
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	35.1 28.2 14.9	31.5 28.3 20.5	32.5 35.7 16.8	37.6 31.9 16.1
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0 11.8	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8 12.5	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8 11.7	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0 17.2
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0 11.8	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8 12.5	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8 11.7	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0 17.2
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0 11.8 6.3	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8 12.5 4.6	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8 11.7 2.6	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0 17.2
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0 11.8 6.3 Daily	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8 12.5 4.6 Weekly	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8 11.7 2.6 Monthly or less 35.4 28.9	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0 17.2
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0 11.8 6.3 Daily 32.3	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8 12.5 4.6 Weekly 33.6 31.2 18.7	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8 11.7 2.6 Monthly or less 35.4 28.9 17.2	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0 17.2
Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Age Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement Community Visibility Traffic Enforcement Some other activity Visits Downtown Crime Prevention Drug Enforcement	35.1 28.2 14.9 18.3 3.4 18-29 33.0 29.9 19.0 11.8 6.3 Daily 32.3 35.0	31.5 28.3 20.5 14.4 5.2 30-44 34.2 32.9 15.8 12.5 4.6 Weekly 33.6 31.2	32.5 35.7 16.8 11.0 4.1 45-64 35.0 31.9 18.8 11.7 2.6 Monthly or less 35.4 28.9	37.6 31.9 16.1 10.9 3.6 65 and older 33.4 29.8 16.0 17.2

Some other activity 5.5

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05



Demographics

Gender (%)		Area of City	(%)	Income (%)		Education (%)		Age (%)	
Male	48.9	South	33.7	Under \$40,000	30.0	H-School/less	18.7	18-29	25.3
Female	51.1	North	28.7	\$40-100,000	44.7	Some P-Sec.	27.5	30-44	17.4
		West	37.6	Over \$100,000	25.3	Col-Tech-Grad	25.2	45-64	31.5
						University Grad	28.6	65 or older	25.8

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Questions

How would you rate the job the Lethbridge police are doing in policing our community?

We would like to know how the Lethbridge Police Service is meeting your expectations about what the police should be doing to keep Lethbridge a safe and secure place to live and work.

In the past year, would you say that Lethbridge Police Service has improved in meeting your expectations of what a police service should be doing, has neither improved nor worsened, or that Lethbridge Police Service has gotten worse in meeting your expectations of what a police service should be doing?

Overall, how would you rate Lethbridge Police Service officers' attitudes and behavior?

Have you had direct contact with a Lethbridge Police Service officer in the past year?

Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighborhood?

Please tell me if your feelings of safety in your neighborhood have changed in the past year. Would you say that you feel much more safe in your neighborhood than you did one year ago, somewhat more safe, no more or less safe than a year ago, somewhat less safe, or much less safe in your neighborhood than you did one year ago?

[Probe: only for those who stated they feel somewhat or much less safe]

In your own words, please tell me if there is one reason why you feel less safe in your neighborhood this year than you did one year ago?

Overall, how safe do you feel when you visit downtown Lethbridge for work, business, shopping or entertainment (including dining)?

How often do you visit downtown Lethbridge for work, business, shopping, or entertainment (including dining)?

Please tell me which of the following activities you would prefer Lethbridge Police Service to devote greater time and resources to: 1st & 2nd choices

- Traffic Enforcement (including more checkstops, equipment checks, speed enforcement)
- Community Visibility (including more bicycle or foot patrols, police cars in your neighborhood)
- Drug Enforcement (including increased staffing in drug units to deal with trafficking)
- Crime Prevention (programs or projects intended to stop offenses before they occur, possibly including education on a new type of fraud, or placement of cameras in high crime areas to deter thefts)
- Some Other Activity

