

VANCOUVER POLICE DEPARTMENT PLANNING, RESEARCH & AUDIT SECTION

July 3, 2008

To:

A/Insp. Earl Andersen

From:

Kristie McCann

Strategic Research and Policy Advisor

Subject:

Priority 3 & 4 Calls in Districts 1 and 2

This report summarizes the number of calls for service categorized as priority 3 or 4 calls in Districts 1 and 2 as requested by Insp. Rai. Total numbers reflect the *total* for those two districts only (*not* the City of Vancouver). Because of expected seasonal fluctuations in the number of calls received by the Vancouver Police Department (VPD), data was taken from three time periods lasting 2 months each: July/August 2007; November/December 2007; and April/May 2008. For each time period, the total number of calls for each incident type were calculated (only the top 15 are listed) for each district. As well, information on how the calls were cleared was analyzed by each type of incident.

Calls for Service in District 1 & 2

As seen in Tables 1, 2, and 3, it is clear that though there are some differences between District 1 and District 2 in terms of priority 3 and 4 calls, there is considerable similarity. The districts suffer from a high level of calls regarding Theft and Annoying Circumstances. In particular, it should be noted that District 1 tends to have a higher level of Thefts, and District 2 tends to have a higher level of Annoying Circumstances. Overall, Thefts make up 9.3-9.9% of all priority 3 and 4 calls and Annoying Circumstances make up between 9.7-11% of the priority 3 and 4 calls. In total, these two call types alone make up approximately 20% of the calls in this priority categorization. These two incident types are the top two for all three samples taken. The top five differs only in rank order, with Disturbance, Assisting the General Public and Property calls rounding out the top five. These top five make up approximately 40% of all priority 3 and 4 calls at all three time periods (Jul/August 20007; November/December 2007; April/May 2008). These

top five call types are quite consistent across time periods, though the absolute numbers of calls change over time (the summer sample had the highest absolute numbers and the winter sample had the lowest)¹.

Table 1- Top 15 Priority 3 and 4 Call Incident Types for D1 and D2 for July and August 2007

| Incident Type | D1 | D2 | Total |
|--|------|-------|-------|
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | 858 | 1170 | 2028 |
| THEFT | 1079 | 712 | 1791 |
| DISTURBANCE | 868 | 852 | 1720 |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | 471 | 800 | 1271 |
| PROPERTY | 515 | 585 | 1100 |
| WARRANT | 324 | 700 | 1024 |
| SUSPICIOUS PERSON | 410 | 445 | 855 |
| SIPP / DIPP | 458 | 216 | 674 |
| SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES | 229 | 348 | 577 |
| 15(1) | E | 1 | |
| BREACH | 219 | 259 | 478 |
| B&E REPORT | 225 | 248 | 473 |
| ARREST | 155 | 251 | 406 |
| TRAFFIC INCIDENT | 169 | 230 | 399 |
| TRAFFIC SUSPENSION / 24 HR / 12 HR / PROHIB NOTICE | 140 | 255 | 395 |
| Grand Total (for all calls) | | 15(1) | |

Table 2- Top 15 Priority 3 and 4 Call Incident Types for D1 and D2 for November and December 2007

| Incident Type | D1 | D2 | Total |
|---|-----|-------|-------|
| THEFT | 981 | 550 | 1531 |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | 692 | 805 | 1497 |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | 375 | 676 | 1051 |
| DISTURBANCE | 476 | 546 | 1022 |
| PROPERTY | 329 | 556 | 885 |
| WARRANT | 220 | 575 | 795 |
| 15(1) | | 1 | |
| TRAFFIC SUSPENSION / 24 HR / 12 HR / PROHIB | 339 | 278 | 617 |
| NOTICE | | | |
| SUSPICIOUS PERSON | 246 | 296 | 542 |
| SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES | 183 | 281 | 464 |
| SIPP / DIPP | 280 | 150 | 430 |
| OTHER CRIMINAL CODE | 181 | 191 | 372 |
| B&E REPORT | 184 | 182 | 366 |
| ALARM | 157 | 181 | 338 |
| TRAFFIC INCIDENT | 141 | 183 | 324 |
| Grand Total (for all calls) | | 15(1) | |

¹ It should be noted that the top five were identified by Total Calls. The top five calls for each District may differ slightly from the total and from each other for each time period analyzed.

Table 3 - Top 15 Priority 3 and 4 Call Incident Types for D1 and D2 for April and May 2008

| Incident Type | D1 | D2 | Total |
|---|------|------|-------|
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | 779 | 1051 | 1830 |
| THEFT | 1147 | 487 | 1634 |
| DISTURBANCE | 600 | 668 | 1268 |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | 427 | 698 | 1125 |
| PROPERTY | 348 | 619 | 967 |
| WARRANT | 231 | 623 | 854 |
| 15(1) | | | |
| SUSPICIOUS PERSON | 308 | 362 | 670 |
| SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES | 169 | 309 | 478 |
| TRAFFIC INCIDENT | 174 | 267 | 441 |
| TRAFFIC SUSPENSION / 24 HR / 12 HR / PROHIB | | | |
| NOTICE | 175 | 255 | 430 |
| SIPP / DIPP | 225 | 151 | 376 |
| OTHER CRIMINAL CODE | 182 | 180 | 362 |
| B&E REPORT | 177 | 177 | 354 |
| MISCHIEF | 112 | 222 | 334 |
| 15(1) | | | |

Call Dispatches

The number of dispatches was also analyzed to account for calls that resulted in more than one dispatch. As expected the number of dispatches exceeds that of the number of calls. The ten call types with the highest number of dispatches can be seen in Tables 4, 5, and 6 below for each of the three time periods. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Annoying Circumstances and Disturbance calls resulted in the highest number of dispatches at all three time periods (around 8-9% each). Assisting the Public is also in the top of the list consistently; however, Warrant and SIPP/DIPP calls were also high on the list across the time periods. Theft and Property calls (which were in the top five call types) were found near the bottom of the list, suggesting that these calls required fewer dispatches than the other, more minor call types.

Table 4 - Top 15 Incident Types for Dispatches in July/August 2007

| Incident Type | | D1 | D2 | Total | |
|------------------------|------------------|------|-------|-------|--|
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | total dispatches | 1081 | 1248 | 2329 | |
| | % of Total | | | 8.96% | |
| DISTURBANCE | total dispatches | 1163 | 1035 | 2198 | |
| | % of Total | | | 8.46% | |
| WARRANT | total dispatches | 644 | 1068 | 1712 | |
| | % of Total | | | 6.59% | |
| SIPP / DIPP | total dispatches | 1121 | 565 | 1686 | |
| | % of Total | | | 6.49% | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | total dispatches | 647 | 772 | 1419 | |
| | % of Total | | 5.46% | | |
| SUSPICIOUS PERSON | total dispatches | 651 | 693 | 1344 | |

| Grand Total % of Total | | 49.76% | 50.24% | 100.00% |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| Grand Total (all) dispatches | | 12930 | 13056 | 25986 |
| | % of Total | | | 3.29% |
| B&E REPORT | total dispatches | 402 | 452 | 854 |
| | % of Total | | | 3.54% |
| ARREST | total dispatches | 444 | 476 | 920 |
| | % of Total | | | 3.71% |
| SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES | total dispatches | 375 | 589 | 964 |
| | % of Total | | | 4.25% |
| BREACH | total dispatches | 573 | 532 | 1105 |
| | % of Total | | | 5.17% |

Table 5 - Top 15 Incident Types for Dispatches in November/December 2007

| Incident Type | | D1 | D2 | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|---------|--|
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | total dispatches | 847 | 919 | 1766 | |
| | % of Total | | | 8.18% | |
| DISTURBANCE | total dispatches | 711 | 732 | 1443 | |
| | % of Total | | | 6.68% | |
| WARRANT | total dispatches | 454 | 915 | 1369 | |
| | % of Total | | | 6.34% | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | total dispatches | 562 | 646 | 1208 | |
| | % of Total | | | 5.59% | |
| SIPP / DIPP | total dispatches | 739 | 387 | 1126 | |
| | % of Total | | | 5.21% | |
| TRAFFIC SUSPENSION / 24 HR / 12 HR / | total dispatches | 573 | 520 | 1093 | |
| PROHIB NOTICE | % of Total | | *************************************** | 5.06% | |
| SUSPICIOUS PERSON | total dispatches | 391 | 471 | 862 | |
| | % of Total | | | 3.99% | |
| SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES | total dispatches | 339 | 495 | 834 | |
| | % of Total | | <u> </u> | 3.86% | |
| OTHER CRIMINAL CODE | total dispatches | 401 | 415 | 816 | |
| | % of Total | | *************************************** | 3.78% | |
| B&E REPORT | total dispatches | 386 | 367 | 753 | |
| | % of Total | | *************************************** | 3.49% | |
| Grand Total (all) dispatches | | 10106 | 11495 | 21601 | |
| Grand Total % of Total | | 46.78% | 53.22% | 100.00% | |

Table 6 - Top 15 Incident Types for Dispatches in April/May 2008

| ncident Type | | D1 | D2 | Total |
|------------------------|------------------|---|--|-------|
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | total dispatches | 962 | 1146 | 2108 |
| | % of Total | | | 9.87% |
| DISTURBANCE | total dispatches | 892 | 897 | 1789 |
| | % of Total | ······································ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 8.38% |
| WARRANT | total dispatches | 464 | 920 | 1384 |
| | % of Total | | ······································ | 6.48% |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | total dispatches | 570 | 736 | 1306 |
| | % of Total | | | 6.12% |
| SUSPICIOUS PERSON | total dispatches | 483 | 547 | 1030 |
| | % of Total | *************************************** | | 4.82% |

| SIPP / DIPP | total dispatches | 595 | 360 | 955 |
|--|------------------|---|---|-------|
| | % of Total | | *************************************** | 4.47% |
| TRAFFIC SUSPENSION / 24 HR / 12 HR / PROHIB NOTICE | total dispatches | 307 | 480 | 787 |
| | % of Total | | | 3.69% |
| SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES | total dispatches | 294 | 483 | 777 |
| | % of Total | *************************************** | | 3.64% |
| ARREST | total dispatches | 271 | 494 | 765 |
| | % of Total | | | 3.58% |
| | 15(1) | | , | |
| | % of Total | | *************************************** | 3.27% |
| Grand Total (all) dispatches | | | 15(1) | |
| Grand Total % of Total | | | 13(1) | |

Call Clearance Type

It is important to consider how these calls are being cleared after they are dispatched. Analysis was done to examine how the various call types were cleared for each time period in order to show, in particular, how many calls are cancelled, requiring no report or were GOA calls, indicating little police action was required (if any at all in the case of cancelled calls). As well the number of reports submitted was examined. Data shown here are only for the top five incident types, but the data for all call types in the priority 3 and 4 categorizations are available. Only the top five are shown because they make up 40% of all the calls in these priority categories and thus are likely representative of the patterns seen for other incident types.

As can be seen in Tables 7, 8, and 9, the majority of calls for service result in no report being filed (50% to 83% for each type of incident over the three time periods). However, the number of cancelled calls varies drastically over the time periods. Property calls in November/December 2007 had the lowest proportion of calls (0.79%), and Assisting the General Public calls had the highest (19.83%) overall. There was a fair amount of variation within each incident type as well. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the fewest cancelled calls were for Theft (1.31% -1.95%) and Property (0.79% - 1.91%). The highest levels of cancelled calls were for Assisting the Public (18.27%-19.83%) and Disturbance (14.27% -14.87%) calls. Annoying Circumstances calls were cancelled between 10.75% and 12.40% of the time. Though Annoying Circumstances does not have a very high level of cancelled calls, this type of call resulted in high levels of calls cleared because of the person(s) being GOA (18.74% - 26.48%). This issue is also seen with Disturbance calls (9.46% - 14.13%) but the proportions of calls cleared by GOA are not as high as those for Annoying Circumstances.

Overall for the top five call incident types, the percentage where a report was submitted ranged from a low of 4.73% for Disturbance calls in November/December to a high of 43.45% for Property calls in July/August. However, as with cancelled calls, there was variation in the number of reports filed based on the incident type. Annoyance calls received the fewest reports (9.02% - 10.69%) though Disturbance calls were not far behind (4.73% - 12.07%). The remaining three had substantially higher levels of reports submitted (Theft: 15.02%-20.69%; Assisting the Public: 18.17%-20.46%; Property: 37.18% - 43.45%). Property in particular appears to have a very high level of calls result in a report, 17% or more than any other type of call.

Table 7- Top 5 Incident Types and Clearance Type for July and August 2007²

| Table 7- Top 5 Incident Types and Cid | | | | | % of Calls |
|---------------------------------------|--|------|-------|-------|---|
| | Oissand Day | D4 | D2 | Total | for Incident |
| Incident Type | Cleared By | D1 | | | Туре |
| | Assist by Outside Agency | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0.440/ |
| | Duplicate | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0.44% |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | GOA | 189 | 348 | 537 | 26.48% |
| | Cancelled | 104 | 114 | 218 | 10,75% |
| | No Report | 455 | 599 | 1054 | 51.97% |
| | Report | 93 | 94 | 187 | 9.22% |
| | Unfounded | 6 | 1 | 7 | |
| | Warning | 6 | 3 | 9 | |
| | Automatically | | 1 | 1 | |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES Total | | 858 | 1170 | 2028 | |
| | Duplicate | | - 1 | - 1 | 0.06% |
| THEFT | GOA | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.33% |
| | Cancelled | 18 | -17 | 35 | 1,95% |
| | No Report | 871 | 549 | 1420 | 79.29% |
| | Report | 189 | 140 | 329 | 18.37% |
| | Unfounded | | 4 | 4 | |
| THEFT Total | | 1079 | 712 | 1791 | |
| | Assist by Outside Agency | 2 | 3 | 5 | |
| DISTURBANCE | Duplicate | 13 | 5 | - 18 | 1.05% |
| | GOA | 129 | 114 | 243 | 14.13% |
| | Cancelled | 127 | - 119 | 246 | 14.30% |
| | No Report | 458 | 507 | 965 | 56.10% |
| | Report | 97 | 76 | 173 | 10.06% |
| | Unfounded | 23 | 8 | 31 | |
| | Warning | 17 | 20 | 37 | |
| | Automatically | 2 | | 2 | |
| DISTURBANCE Total | The state of the s | 868 | 852 | 1720 | enne e est atumbie e e el inemé e entitibil el est entition minimismo de vivia e e vi a vide. |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | Assist by Outside Agency | 8 | 9 | 17 | |

² Only clearance codes used during the time period are shown in the tables, thus the number of call clearance codes differ by call type and time period.

| | Duplicate | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0.63% |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| | GÓA | 28 | 31 | 59 | 4.64% |
| | Cancelled | 87 | 165 | 252 | 19.83% |
| | No Report | 218 | 470 | 688 | 54.13% |
| | Report | 117 | 114 | 231 | 18.17% |
| | Unfounded | 6 | 7 | 13 | |
| The second secon | Warning | 1 | | 1 | |
| | Automatically | | 2 | 2 | |
| | | | | | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC Total | | 471 | 800 | 1271 | |
| | Duplicate | 471 | 800 1 | 1271 1 | 0.09% |
| PROPERTY | Duplicate GOA | 471 | | | 0.09% |
| | | 471 | 1 | 1 | |
| | GÓA | | 1 | 1 | 0.09% |
| | GOA Cancelled | 11 | 1 1 10 | 1 1 21 | 0.09% 1.91% |
| | GOA Cancelled No Report | 11 271 | 1 1 10 327 | 1 1 21 598 | 0.09% 1.91% 54.36% |

Table 8 - Top 5 Incident Types and Clearance Type for November and December 2007

| | | | | | % of Calls for |
|------------------------------|--|-----|-----|-------|----------------|
| Incident Type | Cleared By | D1 | D2 | Total | Incident Type |
| | Duplicate | | 2 | 2 | 0.13% |
| THEFT | GOA | | 3 | 3 | 0.20% |
| | Cancelled | 10 | 10 | 20 | 1.31% |
| | No Report | 838 | 433 | 1271 | 83.02% |
| | Report | 131 | 99 | 230 | 15.02% |
| | Unfounded | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| | Automatically | | 1 | 1 | |
| THEFT Total | | 981 | 550 | 1531 | |
| | Assist by Outside Agency | 1 | 4 | 5 | |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | Duplicate | 1 | 6 | 7 | 0.47% |
| | GOA | 110 | 179 | 289 | 19.31% |
| | Cancelled | 81 | 88 | 169 | 11.29% |
| | No Report | 412 | 438 | 850 | 56.78% |
| | Report | 78 | 82 | 160 | 10.69% |
| | Unfounded | 7 | 2 | 9 | |
| | Warning | 2 | 6 | 8 | |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES Total | | 692 | 805 | 1497 | |
| | Assist by Outside Agency | 1 | 5 | 6 | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | Duplicate | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0.86% |
| | GOA | 21 | 24 | 45 | 4.28% |
| | Cancelled | 50 | 142 | 192 | 18.27% |
| | No Report | 198 | 376 | 574 | 54.61% |
| | Report | 96 | 119 | 215 | 20.46% |
| | Unfounded | 4 | 4 | 8 | |
| | Warning | 4 | | 1 | |
| | Automatically | 1 | | 1 | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC Total | - and the second | 375 | 676 | 1051 | |
| DISTURBANCE | Assist by Outside Agency | | 2 | 2 | |

| *** | Duplicate | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0.49% |
|--|--------------------------|-----|-----|------|--------|
| ************************************** | GOA | 57 | 60 | 117 | 11.45% |
| | Cancelled | 70 | 82 | 152 | 14.87% |
| 9 | No Report | 263 | 308 | 571 | 55.87% |
| | Report | 71 | 77 | 148 | 4.73% |
| OVER THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE | Unfounded | 7 | 8 | 15 | |
| An anomalous de la constanta d | Warning | 6 | 5 | 11 | |
| ************************************** | Automatically | | 1 | 1 | |
| DISTURBANCE Total | | 476 | 546 | 1022 | |
| | Assist by Outside Agency | 1 | | 1 | |
| PROPERTY | Duplicate | 1 | | 1 | 0.11% |
| T-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1 | GOA | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0.34% |
| | Cancelled | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0.79% |
| | No Report | 204 | 338 | 542 | 61.24% |
| | Report | 119 | 210 | 329 | 37.18% |
| The second secon | Unfounded | | 1 | 1 | |
| | Automatically | | 1 | 1 | |
| PROPERTY Total | | 329 | 556 | 885 | |

Table 9 - Top 5 Incident Types and Clearance Types for April and May 2008

| | | | | | % of Calls for Incident |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|------|---|-------|--|
| Incident Type | Cleared by | D1 | D2 | Total | Туре |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES | Duplicate | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0.22% |
| | GOA | 116 | 227 | 343 | 18.74% |
| | Cancelled | 108 | 119 | 227 | 12.40% |
| | No Report | 439 | 633 | 1072 | 58.58% |
| | Report | 105 | 60 | 165 | 9.02% |
| | Unfounded | 6 | 1 | 7 | |
| | Warning | 4 | 8 | 12 | İ |
| ANNOYING CIRCUMSTANCES Total | | 779 | 1051 | 1830 | |
| | Duplicate | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.12% |
| THEFT | GOA | 2 | 2.2 | 2 | 0.12% |
| | Cancelled | 12 | 16 | 28 | 1.71% |
| | No Report | 916 | 347 | 1263 | 77.29% |
| | Report | 215 | 123 | 338 | 20.69% |
| | Unfounded | 1 | *************************************** | 1 | - |
| THEFT Total | | 1147 | 487 | 1634 | |
| | Duplicate | 6 | 3 | 9 | 0.71% |
| DISTURBANCE | GOA | 55 | 65 | 120 | 9.46% |
| | Cancelled | 85 | 96 | 181 | 14.27% |
| | No Report | 350 | 426 | 776 | 61.20% |
| | Report | 92 | 61 | 153 | 12.07% |
| | Unfounded | 7 | 9 | 16 | |
| | Warning | 5 | 7 | 12 | |
| | Automatically | | 1 | y. | Transmission of the state of th |
| DISTURBANCE Total | | 600 | 668 | 1268 | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC | Assist by Outside Agency | 4 | 6 | 10 | |

| | Duplicate | 1 1 | | 1 | 0.09% |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|------|--------|
| | GOA | 16 | 23 | 39 | 3.47% |
| | Cancelled | 87 | 132 | 219 | 19.47% |
| | No Report | 216 | 418 | 634 | 56.36% |
| | Report | 97 | 116 | 213 | 18.93% |
| | Unfounded | 6 | 3 | 9 | |
| ASSIST GENERAL PUBLIC Total | | 427 | 698 | 1125 | |
| | Duplicate | | | 1 | 0.10% |
| PROPERTY | GOA | 2 | | 2 | 0.21% |
| | Cancelled | 4 | 8 | 12 | 1.24% |
| | No Report | 211 | 368 | 579 | 59.88% |
| | Report | 130 | 243 | 373 | 38.57% |
| PROPERTY Total | | 348 | 619 | 967 | |

Summary

Overall, it appears that for Priority 3 and 4 calls in Districts 1 and 2 in three time periods (July/August 2007, November/December 2007, and April/May 2008), the majority of calls for service are Annoying Circumstances, Theft, Disturbance, Assisting the Public and Property calls. These five incident types form approximately 40% of the call load for these categorizations. Moreover, for these five incident types, the majority of calls result in no report being filed, GOA and cancelled calls. Of these five, Property has the highest level of calls resulting in a report being filed, though Assisting the Public and Theft calls also had relatively high levels of reports as well. Lastly, the call types with the highest number of dispatches are Annoying Circumstances and Disturbance calls, suggesting that other issues tend to get priority over these more minor calls.

It should be cautioned that considering that these analyses were only done on a total of 6 months worth of calls in the past year (in two month increments, from three "seasons"), it is possible that these numbers are not representative of the entirety of the call load for these two Districts. Considering the consistency in the data however, it is likely that these months are fair representations of the previous year's call load.

POLICE

The Vancouver Police Department began in 1886 with one officer. Since that time, it has grown to over 1300 sworn members and more than 350 civilians.

Mission Statement: In fulfillment of the public trust, the Vancouver Police Department maintains public order, upholds the rule of law and prevents crime.

Our Values:

Integrity: We believe in doing the right things in all circumstances.

Professionalism: We will pursue the highest standards of professionalism in policing.

Accountability: We will maintain the highest ethical and legal standards. Respect: We will be compassionate and respectful in all of our actions.

Our Vision: Canada's leader in policing - providing safety for all.

Governance

The Vancouver Police Board, under the authority of the British Columbia Police Act, governs the Vancouver Police Department. This statute requires that the Board consist of the Mayor, who is also designated as the chair, one person appointed by the municipal council and not more than five other individuals who are all appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Lieutenant Governor in Council appoints board members based on recommendations put forward by the Attorney General, after consultation with the Director of Police Services Division.

Board members reflect community demographics and are chosen based on their active support of the community. They are appointed to a term not exceeding four years and, although they may be re-appointed, cannot hold office for more than six consecutive years. The Board meets on a monthly basis, provides policy direction for the Police Department and insulates it from the political decision-making process.

The Chief Constable of a municipal police department has, under the direction of the municipal police board, general supervision and command of the Department and must perform the duties and functions assigned under law. The Department, under the Chief's direction, must perform its duties and functions respecting the preservation of peace, the prevention of crime and offences against the law and the administration of justice assigned to it, or generally to peace officers, by the Chief Constable, under law.

The Vancouver Police Department is divided into three divisions, with a Deputy Chief Constable commanding each division and reporting to the Chief Constable.

Operations

The Vancouver Police Department is the largest urban police service in British Columbia. It provides service to a city with a resident population of approximately 612,000. Vancouver is the business, entertainment and tourism hub of a census metropolitan area comprised of over 2.25 million people. The unique nature of this census metropolitan area results in the actual number of people in the city at any given time is significantly higher than the official resident population.

The provision of police services for the City of Vancouver is broken down as follows:

Office of the Chief Constable - Chief Constable James Chu

Three sections report directly to the Office of the Chief Constable. These sections inform the public of safety and security issues as in the case of Public Affairs, as well as strive to increase efficiency in the functioning of the Department. The Operations, Operations Support and Support Services Divisions also report to the Chief Constable.

| Section | Unit | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Executive Services | | | |
| Public Affairs | Community Policing Services | | |
| | Victim Services | | |
| | Public Affairs | | |
| Planning, Research and Audit | Organizational Planning | | |
| | Research and Policy | | |
| | Audit | | |

The Operations Division - Deputy Chief Constable Doug LePard

The Operations Division provides a visible policing presence on City streets, combined with investigative support. More visible to the public, uniformed Police officers within this Division respond to calls for assistance from the public and work in partnership with the community through community programs and Community Policing Centers. The Division focuses resources on issues causing the greatest harm to the community. Its aim is to provide a balanced approach between reactive and proactive policing and to improve the quality of life and sense of safety for city residents.

In addition, this Division also includes investigators who provide further investigation of more serious crimes that have already been investigated to a certain level by the uniformed officers. Detectives may be called to crime scenes to assist on or take over investigations and to follow-up on reports submitted by the uniformed officers. Once assigned, these specialized investigators use their expertise, knowledge and skills to bring cases to conclusion.

| Section | Unit |
|--------------------------|--|
| North Command | District 1 Patrol Teams |
| | District 2 Patrol Teams |
| | Mounted Patrol Team |
| | Marine Squad |
| | B.E.T. Enforcement Team |
| South Command | District 3 Patrol Teams |
| | District 4 Patrol Teams |
| | False Alarm Reduction Program (F.A.R.P.) |
| | Traffic Services |
| Investigation | Major Crime |
| | Forensic Services |
| | Special Investigation (e.g. Sexual Offences) |
| Operations Investigation | Crime Analysis |
| | Anti Fencing |
| | General Investigation |
| | Community Policing Services |

Operations Support Division – Deputy Chief Constable Steve Sweeney

The Operations Support Division includes both operational and administrative sections that support the activities of other Departmental units. The Division also supports and administers many relationships and partnerships the Department has with other agencies and integrated policing units. In particular, officers in this Division often deal with special populations, such as gangs or youth, and many are involved in covert operations. As well, this Division deals with large scale event planning, and emergency preparedness.

| Section | Unit | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Criminal Intelligence | Crime Stoppers | |
| Diversity and Aboriginal Policing | Diversity Policing | |
| Emergency and Operational Planning | Emergency Planning | |
| | Operational Planning | |
| Emergency Response | Dog Squad | |
| | Emergency Response Teams | |
| Gangs/Drugs | Drug Squad | |
| - | Gang Crime | |
| | Outlaw Motorcycle Gang | |
| Olympic Policing Planning | Joint Intelligence Group | |
| Tactical Support | Surveillance Teams | |
| • • | Surveillance Support Teams | |
| Youth Services | Youth Services | |
| | School Liaison | |
| | Graffīti | |
| | Police Community Response | |

Support Services Division - Deputy Chief Constable Bob Rolls

The Support Services Division encompasses most of the administrative sections and units required to support the organization and its operational members.

| Section | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Human Resources | |
| Professional Standards | |
| Training and Recruiting | |
| Communications | |
| Court & Detention Services | |
| Information Management | |
| Information Technology | |
| Facilities | |
| Financial Services Section | |

Vancouver Police Department – Key Contacts

| Position | Responsibilities | Contact Name | Phone Number |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Chief Constable | The Chief Constable has general supervision and command over the police department | Jim Chu | 717-2950 |
| Executive Assistant to the Chief Constable | Executive assistance to Chief Constable | Kim Carter | 717-2964 |
| Executive Director– Vancouver Police Board | Executive assistance to Police Board | Shona McGlashan | 717-3170 |

Vancouver Police Department – Organization Chart

See Following Page

