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Executive Summary

This report examines the emerging roles of BIAs in Metro Vancouver with respect to the amelioration of social issues. The research project investigates BIAs in the City of Vancouver and BIAs in nearby municipalities within the Metro Vancouver region. Literature puts Vancouver at the vanguard of social planning, but nearby municipalities, specifically those within Metro Vancouver, do not necessarily share the same progressive outlook on social issues. The hypothesis that motivates this inquiry then is BIAs in Vancouver, to some degree, likely reflect the city’s ambitious social plan. Whether this hypothesis is valid, and whether or not the effect occurs across the metropolitan region, are telling indications of the overall effects of municipal social policy on the economic objectives of BIAs.

Research questions

- How do business improvement associations in Metro Vancouver (the Greater Vancouver Regional District) perceive social issues, such as homelessness, drug abuse, prostitution, etc. as interrelated in economic objectives?

- What differences exist between business improvement associations in the City of Vancouver and suburban municipalities within the metropolitan region with respect to the perception of and response to social issues?

Summary of Analysis

On the whole, the analysis of the survey responses shows BIAs in the City of Vancouver (hereafter VC) and BIAs in outer municipalities (hereafter OM) display some relevant differences. In terms of service areas, BIAs across Metro Vancouver are all typically highly involved in consumer marketing, but OM BIAs are significantly more likely to be involved in economic development initiatives. VC BIAs are more likely to be involved in the provision of social services than OM BIAs. With that said, the survey findings still suggest BIAs are limited in their involvement in social services even though they generally perceive social issues as relevant to their organizations. Even BIAs created to deal with encroaching social issues are not overwhelming involved in the provision of social services.

Compared to VC BIAs, OM BIAs typically claim their areas tolerate higher levels of social service delivery. Neighbourhood factors, however, suggest OM BIAs generally operate in areas
of their respective communities with indications of higher socioeconomic levels. Conversely, VC BIA
s do not perceive such high levels of social service delivery in their territories but typically
operate in areas of lower socioeconomic levels—areas where conventional wisdom would
suggest actually necessitate higher levels of social services. Accordingly, VC BIA
s might be seen to be more accepting of social service provisions.

BIA
s across the Metro Vancouver region generally perceive social issues in a similar fashion.
That is, property theft, vandalism, homelessness, substance abuse, drug dealing, and panhandling
are all perceived as issues more relevant in the management of Metro Vancouver BIA
s than the
remaining six social issues on the survey. Three social issues, however, were identified that VC
BIA
s perceive as more relevant to their BIA
s than OM BIA
s: street vending, panhandling, and
vandalism. Moreover, municipal policies may, interestingly enough, influence the VC BIA
perception of these issues.

All in all, BIA
s in Metro Vancouver certainly perceive social issues as intertwined in economic
objectives and the results of the survey analysis point to differences between VC and OM BIA
s
with respect to the perception of and response to social issues. The differences noted among
BIA
s in each subsample suggest it is likely that municipal social policies have some affect on the
economic objectives of BIA
s. Whether municipal social policies are the primary factors that
cause these differences is interesting to consider yet inclusive. An in-depth case study analysis is
required in order to draw any significant conclusions about the impact municipal social policies
have on the economic objectives of BIA
s. Future research could evaluate the implications of
municipal polices on the actions of BIA
s and—as this research project demonstrates—the
municipalities of the Metro Vancouver region certainly represent a unique opportunity for such
an inquiry.

Recommendations

This report culminates with three recommendations to help guide the future direction of BIA
s in
BC. The recommendations are from the perspective of BIA
s, municipal governments and, lastly,
the provincial government.

1. BIA
s should extend their policy advocacy positions when social issues are prioritized.
BIAs do conduct advocacy for policies and approaches that address issues relevant to their organizations. However, BIAs in areas with high occurrences of social issues should make policy advocacy a higher order tool. Policy advocacy detracts little from the already limited financial resources of BIAs and functions to establish partnerships and create co-leadership opportunities.

2. Municipalities that foster BIAs as economic development tools should consider how BIAs are involved in local social issues as well as their role in effectuating social planning goals.

Municipalities should reflect on the democratic nature of BIAs and the manner in which they are accountable. BIAs represent private business interests and are business-minded organizations that typically lack the expertise to extend their roles into social service areas. However, municipalities can benefit substantially as BIAs emerge to take on more comprehensive roles in the community.

3. The Province of British Columbia should enable BIAs to evolve toward becoming tools of social innovation.

The Province of British Columbia is in the position to enact legislation that would enable BIAs to evolve into tools for social innovation. The BIA tool is required to be as adaptive as possible in order to respond to the unique social and economic characteristics of the territories in which they operate. New forms of governance would enable BIAs to expand their reach in order to affect social outcomes in the community and build the capacity to address social issues more readily. This vision for BIAs in the future recognizes the unique position of BIAs in the community and among the various sectors of the economy and sees potential for BIAs as a form of social innovation.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

“BIDs are a conspicuous illustration of creative thinking at the local level [...] BIDs have essentially reformulated the concept of service delivery to commercial centers. [...] The job of local government is to legally establish the district, collect the special tax assessments or fees, and then transfer the funds over to a BID organization to use as it sees fit. BIDs are thus ‘a powerful combination of ingredients—business self-interest and vision, together with public financing unencumbered by urban politics.’”

~ Business Improvement Districts and Innovative Service Delivery, Jerry Mitchell, 1999, pp. 9-10

1.1 The History of the BIA Concept and the Research Context

In many ways, the business improvement area concept owes its beginnings to the process of suburbanization and the mass exodus of the central city population to the suburbs in the 1950s and later (Hoyt, 2008; Mitchell, 2008). Its foremost symbol—the suburban shopping mall—led to the decline of downtown areas in many Canadian cities (Hernandez and Jones, 2005). In the mid 1960s however, as suburban shopping malls proliferated, business owners along Bloor Street West in Toronto began to advocate for legislation that would mandate all businesses in the area contribute financially to help revitalize business through marketing campaigns and capital improvements. The concept was patterned after the mandatory maintenance fees and security provisions of the suburban shopping mall. Legislation passed in 1970 and the Bloor West Village BIA became the first business improvement association in existence. The BIA’s success as a community and economic development tool eventually led to the diffusion of the idea internationally. In a study of the international transfer of urban revitalization policy, Lorlene Hoyt surveyed hundreds of BIAs in eight countries and documented the emergence of BIA-like organizations in seven others (2006). Other studies also highlight the global proliferation of the BIA concept, but, more importantly, they document emerging roles for BIAs with respect to policy advocacy, public-private partnerships, municipal/urban governance and security (Houstoun, 2005; Hoyt, 2005c; Peel, Lloyd & Lord, 2009). This report, in a similar fashion, examines the emerging roles of BIAs in Metro Vancouver with respect to the amelioration of social issues.

---

1 There exist regional differences in the terms used to describe business improvement areas (BIAs). Literature coming out of the United States generally refers to BIAs as business improvement districts (BIDs). In South Africa they are called city improvement districts (CIDs). Throughout this report however, the term BIA is used for consistency, and because the research scope focuses on Metro Vancouver where the term BIA is the accepted nomenclature.
Not surprisingly, the dissemination of the BIA concept over the last forty years parallels the trend in neoliberalism—the dominant mode of western political thought over the same time period. Neoliberalism posits an increasing level of responsibility on municipal governments for “a host of social and environmental issues not conventionally understood as municipal concerns” (Mendes, 2008). Not only are municipalities now beleaguered with more responsibility, but they possess limited financial resources with which to fund or operate the growing number of human services now under their umbrella. Enter the business improvement association: an extra-governmental approach to service delivery based on the collective action of business and property owners, but where the municipal role is rather limited. The municipality sanctions their formation, approves their budget annually, and collects the levy from property owners that will fund the BIA. In a general sense, BIAs function as a municipal tool to implement revitalization efforts and provide a range of other services while costing the municipality next to nothing. Considering the success some BIAs have in facilitating neighbourhood transformation efforts then, and the political backdrop that provides the impetus for their creation, the BIA concept has merit and hence its proliferation in Canadian cities as well as on the international stage.

In British Columbia, the formation of BIAs is outlined in two pieces of legislation: the Community Charter regulates the formation and operation of BIAs for municipalities outside Vancouver and the Vancouver Charter stipulates the same for BIAs within the city. In short, BIAs are formed through municipal bylaw and must have the support of a majority of property owners. Once a BIA is established the compulsory levy is added to the property taxes of all business property owners within the geographic area of the BIA. The bylaw also defines the business promotion scheme: the objective of the BIA which may include conducting research, making physical improvements, cleaning up or beautifying the area, conserving heritage structures, or promoting business (Province of British Columbia, 1953 & 2003). Interestingly, nothing in either piece of legislation points directly to a role for BIAs in terms of ameliorating social issues or advocating for various social policy positions. That is not to say that BIAs are not active in these areas. This report in fact makes the assumption that the opposite is true—that BIAs perceive social issues as factors in the economic development objectives which they are mandated to pursue.
The presupposition that BIAs are to some level active in addressing social issues on a local scale motivates the research project. This assumption, as a research concept, emerges from the City of Vancouver’s position at the forefront of social planning, namely its progressive social policies such as the Four Pillars Drug Strategy, for example, or the Insite Supervised Injection Facility. Beyond harm reduction drug policies, and with respect to urban planning in the city since the mid-1980s, Vancouver maintains a “living first” strategy that privileges sustainability in all its forms: social and otherwise (Beasley, 2000). Larry Beasley, former Co-Director of Planning with the City of Vancouver, credits the comprehensive integrated strategy for Vancouver’s urban transition to a highly livable and socially inclusive city. Moreover, Michael Mason, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Geography at the London School of Economics, notes, “Vancouver has a historic commitment to social and ecological sustainability in urban redevelopment, and this now feeds into its self-representation as a world city” (2003). Vancouver consistently ranks among the world’s most livable cities and it has a laudable record of establishing policies that pursue social inclusivity. No stretch of the imagination is required to suggest a strong likelihood that the business improvement areas it mandates also share a similar outlook on social issues. Certainly social planning plays a pivotal role in Vancouver achieving its status as a livable city and the advent of Vancouverism² in architecture and planning literature owes something to the role of the city’s progressive social policies (Bogdanowicz, 2006).

1.2 Statement of the General Problem

In Experiential Planning: A Practitioner’s Account of Vancouver’s Success, Jill Grant draws attention to the intervolution of social issues and urban planning and specifically the role of Vancouver’s “ambitious social agenda” in transforming the city into a place now commended for its livability. This transition in Vancouver over the last twenty (plus) years indicates a place for social planning in community building and urban development. In 1988, about the same time Vancouver began implementing the planning policies, practices, and strategies that would later be recognized as factors in establishing its reputation as a livable city, the province passed BIA legislation. At that time, and even now, BIAs across the province are typically formed to address a range of issues concerning community and economic development. Certainly the mitigation of social issues is an emerging role, but one that remains subordinate. In Vancouver, however, a

² The term “Vancouverism” was coined in the late 1990s to describe the principles of urbanism espoused by city planning officials that privilege livability and density, among other things.
city that planners consider “the exemplar of a modernist city that attempts to be socially inclusionary” (Grant, 2009, p. 359), social issues have tended to carry more clout with municipal planners and policy-makers. Nearby municipalities, on the other hand, including those that comprise the Greater Vancouver Regional District, do not necessarily share the same progressive outlook on social issues. The hypothesis that motivates this inquiry then is BIAs—uniquely positioned among the key actors in the public, private, and voluntary sectors in the community—to some degree, likely reflect the city’s zealous social plan. Whether this hypothesis is valid, and whether or not the effect occurs across the metropolitan region, are telling indications of the overall effects of municipal social policy on the economic objectives of BIAs.

The research questions ask:

- How do business improvement associations in Metro Vancouver (the Greater Vancouver Regional District) perceive social issues, such as homelessness, drug abuse, prostitution, etc. as interwoven in economic objectives?

- What differences exist between business improvement associations in the City of Vancouver and suburban municipalities within the metropolitan region with respect to the perception of and response to social issues?

1.3 Research Scope and Objectives

This study focuses on BIAs in the Greater Vancouver Regional District (renamed Metro Vancouver in 2007 and hereafter referred to as Metro Vancouver). The idea of examining BIAs across the entire metropolitan region rather than the City of Vancouver alone introduces a unit of comparison to analyze the potential effects of Vancouver’s progressive social policies with neighbouring municipalities that might well experience similar social issues but exercise less progressive strategies in response to them. Ultimately though, this study is designed to assess how BIAs currently perceive social issues and research findings, particularly the generation of theoretical knowledge, are relevant to municipalities across Canada. In fact, according to the literature on BIAs there may now be more than 400 BIA-type organizations operating in Canada with more being established every year, which are considerations that lend a great deal of relevance and timeliness to the research project. Furthermore, although the economic objectives and community revitalization efforts typical of BIAs are well-documented in the literature, as yet, virtually no research establishes the relationship among the economic objectives of BIAs
with the localized effects of social issues, in a manner such that the outcomes of one are interrelated within the other. Identifying this complex interconnection within a more localized, municipal framework has the potential to direct strategically an emerging role for BIAs.

Another aspect of this study examines BIA programs or services that target social issues. If BIAs display regard for social issues, how do they perceive them in terms of significance to their respective mandates or in their management of a BIA? And, how do their individual perceptions of social issues compare with other BIAs in Metro Vancouver? If there are differences noted among BIAs, what factors might cause these differences? (e.g. budget and personnel constraints may be factors; other possibilities include community size, the location and concentration of other agencies, services, or organizations in the area, and even, perhaps, indifference).

1.4 Contribution to the Planning Profession

If the dissemination of BIAs across Canada indicates the concept’s general level of acceptance and success as a driver of economic development, then it also supports a rationale to direct research at the emerging roles for BIAs. Planning, by its nature, must consider a multitude of interconnected issues in formulating policies or responses at the municipal level. As such, the BIA concept as a municipal tool to encourage economic development must encompass the broad vision and more comprehensive perspective of the planning profession. In other words, communities that establish BIAs realize the potential economic benefits they bring to the table. But, less clear has been the effect BIAs have on social issues in their immediate territories and, as more BIAs are established, on interstitial areas, too. Examining and then articulating this ambiguous relationship will help augment practical knowledge and thus contribute to the planning profession.

Ultimately, the community bears the brunt of responsibility for managing the response to social issues regardless of whether or not some level of support or direction comes from higher orders of government. Thus, communities that appreciate the interconnectedness of social and economic outcomes, and acknowledge the emerging roles for BIAs with respect to both areas, better position themselves to manage change. And, managing change is now more relevant than ever as communities assume an increasing level of responsibility for their own competitiveness given the dominance of neoliberal urban governance.
Chapter 2 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This research design incorporates two methodological procedures to address the research questions. The primary research method, a survey conducted of the population of Metro Vancouver BIAs, forms the core of the data collection method and is designed to produce quantitative and qualitative data. The analysis of secondary sources contributes to the context of the research problem, which frames the research background and indicates the relevance for this type of inquiry. As well, secondary sources inform the theoretical foundation and, by extension, the research outcomes. The analysis of secondary sources includes scholarly journals, professional reports, and the two different pieces of enabling legislation that affect BIAs in British Columbia. Using an array of data sources and research techniques, such as the design for this research project, provides an effective element of data and methodological triangulation (Gaber & Gaber, 2007; Robson, 2002; Yin, 2009).

The methodological processes for this report are adopted from two prominent BIA researchers, Lorlene Hoyt (Associate Professor of Urban Planning at MIT) and Jerry Mitchell (Professor in the School of Public Affairs, City University of New York). As well, the primary research method and the survey instrument itself are adapted from the work of Hoyt (2005c, 2006 & 2008) and Mitchell (1999 & 2001) and thus are demonstrably successful. The benefits of adopting research methods from authoritative scholars with proven research outcomes extend beyond the convenience of acquiring instant methodological credibility. Take, for instance, the notions of reliability and comparability: the fact that Hoyt first builds her research on the work of Mitchell establishes a history of research findings that then lend themselves nicely to comparison because the methodological procedures and survey instruments are essentially indistinct in design. Altogether, between the inquiries of Hoyt and Mitchell, there exists a clear and reliable outline of BIA research on which to base the design for this report. Not only does this history of research indicate the feasibility and relevance of general research on the subject, but it also fosters future research and gives credence to the subject as a legitimate research area. In other

---

3 The Vancouver Charter governs BIA formation in the City of Vancouver and the Community Charter regulates their formation outside of Vancouver but within the province.
words, Hoyt and Mitchell establish the robustness of research methods and findings, and the research design for this report builds on that foundation.

### 2.2 Procedures for Data Collection

The first step in the process of data collection involved compiling a list of all the BIAs in Metro Vancouver. The City of Vancouver manages a website that provides updated listings and contact information for BIAs; the website organizes the information by BIAs within the City of Vancouver and those within Metro Vancouver. This information was then cross-referenced with the BIA BC membership list (available online), and supplemented with general Internet searches to verify the data were current and accurate.

The initial search revealed 20 BIAs operating within the City of Vancouver and 15 within nearby municipalities. Upon further investigation, I removed three BIAs from the list of 15 due to the fact they operated outside of the Metro Vancouver regional boundary, and thus were beyond the scope of the research project. The final list included 32 BIAs; that list then became the population of BIAs, which I later stratified into two regions (see: Appendix A – Metro Vancouver BIA Population List for the complete list of 32 BIAs). Figure 2.1 shows a map of the approximate locations of the 19 Metro Vancouver BIAs who participated in this project.

---

4 Correspondence with Peter Vaisbord, Coordinator for the City of Vancouver BIA Program, also confirms these findings.

5 The three BIAs removed from the study at this point were: The Downtown Squamish BIA, The Downtown Abbotsford BIA, and the Mission Downtown BIA.

6 At the time of writing this report there were three new BIAs in various stages of approval within Metro Vancouver: Hastings Crossing and West Broadway BIAs in the City of Vancouver and the Lower Lonsdale BIA in North Vancouver.
2.2.1 Stratification

The stratification of all BIAs in the population involved coding the BIAs based on their respective locations within Metro Vancouver. Two regions were used as coding categories: Vancouver City (hereafter VC) and Outer Municipalities (hereafter OM). The VC stratum comprises 20 BIAs located within the Vancouver municipal boundaries. The OM stratum includes 12 BIAs all located in municipalities outside of Vancouver proper but within Metro Vancouver.

The idea of stratifying the BIAs in the population stems from the preliminary research design for this project which sought to sample the population of BIAs in Metro Vancouver. As the research design progressed, however, the data collection methods were modified. Pilot testing of the survey instrument with two BIA Executive Directors led to the idea of collecting data via electronic survey as opposed to telephone interviews. The electronic survey was seen to reduce the time and effort required for an individual to participate in the project, while simultaneously expanding the range of the potential sample—in this case, more than doubling the sample from the initial plan to survey 15 BIA Executive Directors by telephone to the entire population of 32...
BIAs. With the modifications to the research methods, however, the initial stratification concept was maintained.

The locational characteristics of each stratum were drawn to facilitate inquiry into the research problem and the research questions. To explain, the two strata create a unit of analysis to test whether Vancouver’s “ambitious social agenda” is reflected in BIA programs, services, and initiatives in the city itself as well as the outer municipalities within Metro Vancouver. Outer municipalities, of course, endorse their own social policies which may differ from those of the City of Vancouver. Stratifying the population then, provides general insight into the influence of municipal social policy on the role of BIAs, particularly with respect to how BIAs perceive social issues. Furthermore, Robson supports the use of stratification when possible and suggests it can lead to more efficient research outcomes (2002).

2.2.2 Testing and Revisions to the Survey Instrument

Revisions were made to the survey instrument upon several stages of testing. Modifications included reframing four open-ended questions as multiple choice questions, altering the style or format of the questions, and eliminating two questions altogether due to lack of direct relevance to the research questions and to reduce the amount of time necessary to complete the survey. Following the testing stages and subsequent revisions to the survey instrument, the finalized electronic survey included 19 close-ended questions and one open-ended question. Close-ended questions are predominant because they save time and avoid confusion for survey participants (Peterson, 2000). Altogether the process of developing a survey instrument led to eight draft versions being generated. A professional editor, graduate supervisor, and two Executive Directors of BIAs outside of the research area edited and informed the drafts at various stages in the process. Countless more individuals tested the final version of the electronic survey to assure the accuracy and consistency of responses, the efficiency of the data collection techniques, and the relative ease of the electronic submission process.

2.2.3 Justification for Questions on the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument is divided into four sections: Organizational Background, Structure and Scope, Social Issues, and Evolution (see: Appendix B – Survey Instrument). In order to benefit from the learned experiences of previous researchers studying BIAs, questions in three of the four aforementioned sections were largely drawn and adapted from similar survey instruments,
namely Hoyt (2004, 2005c, 2006 & 2008) and Mitchell (1999 & 2001). Mitchell devised the original survey instrument, which Hoyt later adapted, after reviewing professional surveys conducted by various city administrators, government corporation executives, the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership and the Urban Land Institute. Therefore, to a significant extent, earlier professional and academic research on BIAs informs the survey instrument for my own research project, too.

The section of the survey instrument titled, *Social Issues*, includes seven questions that were not adapted from previous surveys; the questions were developed specifically in order to examine the unique research questions for this report. The questions were developed to be stylistically and syntactically compatible with questions from other sections. In developing the questions for the Social Issues section, a comprehensive list of social issues was first compiled. Informal interviews, discussions with BIA professionals, background research, and personal experience volunteering with one Metro Vancouver BIA inform the compilation of the list. Later, reflecting on the nature of the research problem, social issues that could not be categorized as detrimental to the effects of economic objectives, as, say, multiculturalism for instance, were removed from the list because the study proposed an examination of those social issues that could have a detrimental impact on BIA economic objectives.

The following section provides a justification for each of the questions on the survey instrument. A brief note on the process of coding the response data for analysis is provided where appropriate, as well as information to connect the underlying idea and purpose of the question to literature on the subject. In addition, an effort has been made to indicate how participant responses were analyzed with other responses, including PCensus data for BIA neighbourhoods.

**Organizational Background**

The Organizational Background section contains four questions. Basically, the questions were designed to generate a level of knowledge and understanding of the conditions that led to the creation of the BIA, with the realization that these conditions likely influence how BIAs perceive social issues.
**Question 1: In what year was your organization legally established?**

The quantitative responses to this question do not require coding other than categorization for data analysis. A review of the literature (Hoyt, 2007 & 2005c; Levy, 2001; Mitchell, 1999) indicates that over time BIAs modify their role and the services they offer and thus the age of the BIA could be a factor in determining if or how they perceive social issues. Certainly new BIAs are seldom if ever formed with the sole purpose of addressing social issues but, if BIAs are active in addressing social issues, is the age of the BIA a factor? Do older or more established BIAs play a more significant role in advocating for policies with social implications? Responses to this survey question were compared with other BIAs, BIA averages, and cross-tabulated with the information collected in the Social Issues section of the survey to determine possible relationships.

**Question 2: How long have you served in your current position?**

The Executive Director of each BIA was asked to complete the survey and their responses were taken as representative of the organization. Responses to this question are coded as a positive integer representing the number of months the Executive Director has served. Similar to Question 1, term duration could be a factor in how BIAs perceive social issues. Responses were compared to other questions in a similar fashion to the above. This information also assists in determining how much experience the participant possesses and how familiar they are with the various issues related to the position.

**Question 3: Which best describes the group(s) responsible for forming the organization?**

This is a multiple choice question with four options; the participant may choose one answer. Responses are coded numerically based on the answer selected, for example: (a) = 1, (b) = 2, (c) = 3, (d) = 4. In previous BIA research (Hoyt, 2005c, 2006 & 2008; Isakov, 2009; Mitchell, 1999 & 2001) this question was deemed valuable because the group responsible for creating the BIA was seen to display an obvious connection to and relationship with the reasons for its creation.

---

7 It was imperative to conduct the survey with the Director of each BIA to assure the information collected came from identical perspectives across the population. In most instances, this person’s title was Executive Director, but with some smaller BIAs, such as those with only a single employee, titles did vary slightly. Alternative titles included Coordinator, Manager, and President. When contacting the BIAs, particularly the smaller BIAs, alternative titles were accepted as equivalent to the Executive Director title—the personnel possessing the highest level of knowledge and experience within the organization.
which is fundamental to its operational purpose. Informal discussions with BIA professionals in British Columbia indicates, in most cases, business or property owners likely best describes the group(s) responsible for forming the organization. City officials, however, are increasingly promoting the BIA concept as a municipal tool to address a range of issues and certainly social issues are on their radar. Thus, this question is closely linked to Question 4 and provides interesting cross-tabulations with the information collected in the social issues section.

**Question 4: Which of the following describe the original reason(s) for creating the business improvement association?**

This is a multiple choice question with six options; the participant may choose all that apply. Responses are coded numerically, either 0 for ‘not selected’ or 1 for ‘selected,’ with each possible selection being treated as a unique sub-question for analysis. Responses were also compared in much the same manner is in Question 3. A literature review indicates the original reasons for creating the organization span the range of the possible options provided, with the exception of (c) To deal with encroaching social issues. The range of possible options was also augmented during pilot testing. The justification to include this question in the survey is that it speaks to the foundation of the organization and reveals the original purpose of its existence. Also, categorizing responses here provides insight into the morphology of the BIA and allows the researcher to formulate theories as to how, why, and if BIAs in Metro Vancouver over time come to take on more social responsibility.

**Organizational Structure and Scope**

The Organizational Structure and Scope section contains six questions. These questions distinguish the organizational and territorial size of BIAs in the population. Responses to these questions form categories useful in comparison across organizations. Again, the literature (Gross, 2005; Mitchell, 1999) suggests that larger and ultimately better-funded BIAs are able to provide more services and, by logical extension, address a larger range of issues. Responses to all the questions in this section were cross-tabulated with responses from the social issues section in order to gauge the role of BIA size in its perception of social issues.
*Question 5: Currently, your organization has how many full-time employees?*

This question is quantitative in nature and does not require coding. Its primary purpose is to help establish the relative size of the BIA organization in order to compare amongst the population and cross-tabulate with responses from other sections. The literature indicates that the size of the organization is a key factor in determining the programs and services the BIA offers and what, if any, social issues it can address.

*Question 6: Currently, your organization has how many part-time employees?*

Like the previous question, the primary purpose of Question 6 is to help establish the relative size of the BIA organization in order to compare amongst other BIAs. This information was also cross-tabulated with data from other sections.

*Question 7: How many members serve on your governing board?*

As above, information collected here helps determine the size of the organization but also sheds light on the manner in which the organization is influenced. To explain, background research and pilot testing interviews suggest that board members are often community leaders who may possess an interest in social issues. Although it may be equally likely board members display little regard for social issues, regardless of the debate, statistically speaking, larger boards are more likely to be comprised of individuals with a stake in the social outcomes of the neighbourhood. In addition, the size of the governing board establishes categories useful in comparison with questions whose possible responses include aspects of board composition (Gross, 2005).

*Question 8: Approximately how many properties are located in the business improvement area?*

Similar to the previous three questions, Question 8 helps to determine the size of the BIA. In this case however, size will be determined with respect to the territorial limits as opposed to organizational extent. Information collected here was compared to the social issues section to indicate the role of BIA size in determining the level and extent of the BIA perception of social

---

8 Board members are typically BIA members, either a property owner or tenant of a business property in the BIA territory. Board members are voted in at an AGM.
issues. Information on the territorial size of the BIA is also relevant for producing and comparing PCensus statistics for the area.

**Question 9: What is your organization’s approximate annual budget?**

Here, the question is justified because it provides essential information for comparison among other BIAs. Previous BIA research (Levy, 2001; Mitchell, 1999) shows that budget limitations are a major factor in determining the general role BIAs are able to play in the revitalization of the neighbourhood. Background research (Mitchell, 1999) indicates that larger or better-funded BIAs implement more programs directed at social issues. Not only does information collected here allow for useful categorization of BIAs, but it also provides interesting comparison with PCensus neighbourhood data (census data was collected on the following criteria: average household income, unemployment rate, and the number of families by prevalence of low income).

**Question 10: Please indicate the degree to which your organization is involved in the following services:** Capital improvements, Consumer marketing, Economic development, Maintenance, Public space regulation, Public advocacy, Security, and Social services.

This question is the cornerstone of previous survey research conducted on BIA service provision (particularly Mitchell, 1999 & 2001 and Hoyt, 2005c & 2008). Information about the extent and process of how BIAs are involved in providing services not only indicates the range and pattern of BIA services, but also, when compared to data collected on the organizational structure and size of BIAs, brings to light the emergent role of BIAs in addressing social issues. Comparing data collected here against other responses identifies some of the factors that affect how individual BIA mandates evolve over time and space. Beyond service provision, Paul Levy notes BIA roles are emerging in several ways: BIAs “are clearly exercising a vital leadership role in their communities, articulating strategic alternatives, forging coalitions for change, and successfully implementing entrepreneurial solutions to chronic urban problems” (2001, p. 130).

Each identified service is categorized as a separate question and their responses to each are coded in the following manner: Very Involved = 1, Somewhat Involved = 2 and Not at all Involved = 3. Mitchell (1999) first developed the three-point scale to capture participant responses with ease and clarity. The fact that similar survey instruments and the same response
scale were later used in no fewer than four professional and academic surveys indicates with some authority its effectiveness as a question style.

**Social Issues**

The Social Issues section contains seven questions. The questions in this section of the survey instrument were designed to provide distinct variables for analysis with responses from other questions and are pivotal in the investigation of the research question. In fact, data collected from this section of the survey informs the core component of the research project and distinguishes it from previous BIA research. Accordingly, the attempt to draw connections to existing literature for questions in this section should recognize that little or no previous research has been conducted that specifically examines the connection between social issues in a municipality and BIA economic objectives. Thus, the effort to justify the inclusion of these questions in the survey drawing on previous research is limited and focuses on more general concepts.

**Question 11:** To what extent do you consider the following as social issues relevant to your management of a business improvement area? (Unemployment, Adult literacy, Homelessness, Panhandling, Vandalism (including graffiti), Property theft, Substance abuse, Drug dealing, Prostitution, Gang violence, Squeegee kids, and Street vendors).

Following the same three-point scale as Question 10, responses are coded similarly: Very Significant = 1, Somewhat Significant = 2, and Not Significant = 3. Data collected here forms the fundamental basis required to examine the research questions. If BIAs in Metro Vancouver perceive social issues as part of their economic mission, then it is not only interesting to see what social issues are relevant in their management of the organization, but also what other factors influence how they perceive them. This question breaks apart the general use of the term social issue and separates issues to be examined individually. In, *Managing Downtown’s Social Behavior*, Elizabeth Jackson discusses how BIAs are increasingly perceiving social issues such as homelessness and substance abuse as deterrents in their attempt to attract and serve customers and new investment (2006).
Question 12: Referring to those social issues you consider very significant from your responses in the previous question, briefly describe any specific programs, services, or advocacy that your organization undertakes. (Unemployment, Adult literacy, Homelessness, Panhandling, Vandalism (including graffiti), Property theft, Substance abuse, Drug dealing, Prostitution, Gang violence, Squeegee kids, and Street vendors).

Responses to this question are qualitative and are not coded for statistical analysis in the same manner as other qualitative questions. Instead, the purpose of the question is to collect data on how BIAs in Metro Vancouver respond to social issues. Assuming BIAs respond to encroaching social issues in some manner, this question gathers data on the types of programs, services, or advocacy they undertake. In terms of data analysis this information was categorized and represented generally in a discussion of BIA programs and services.

Question 13: Based on the number of complaints or concerns from BIA members, please rank the five most persistent social issues.

For this question, the survey instrument contains five boxes ranked 1 through 5—each box is comprised of a drop-down menu that allows the participant to select from the range of identified social issues. In terms of coding, each of the social issues on the menu is assigned a value between 1 and 12. If the participant chose the social issue coded 8 in ranking box 1, for example, that selection is deemed to be the most persistent concern for members, and so on down through the top five. The question also allows for the selection of “No Persistent Issues” as an option.

The data gathered from this question, along with other responses in the Social Issues section of the survey, when compared by subsample, reveal possible reasons why and how BIAs perceive social issues. The rather in-depth and detailed nature of this question and the lack of previous BIA research connecting social issues to economic objectives leave this question without a direct precedent in the literature. Hoyt, however, examines the types and persistence of crime in BIAs for comparison among several nations9 (2004).

---

9 Hoyt’s report examines BIAs organized along seven geographic categories: six countries (including Canada) and continental Europe.
**Question 14: How does your organization prioritize social issues that are deemed actionable?**

This is a multiple choice question that allows respondents to choose all applicable answers. Each possible selection is dealt with as an individual question and responses are coded as either 0 = ‘not selected’ or 1 = ‘selected.’ Kate Joncas (2006) insists one of the biggest challenges BIAs face is prioritizing community issues. Certainly most, if not all, community issues affect BIAs in some manner, she argues, and there are simply too many issues to address. The purpose of this question then is to generate knowledge about how BIA priorities are developed.

**Question 15: What factors limit your organization’s role in planning for social issues?**

Like Question 14, this is also a multiple choice/choose all the apply question and responses are coded in the same manner. The question is designed so that the theme of each possible response links to other questions in the survey. For instance, if an organization’s budget limits its role in planning for social issues, it is certainly interesting to know the amount of their budget (Question 9). Cross-tabulating such responses provides a picture of how, when, and why BIAs take on social planning goals. Interestingly, Levy notes that when BIAs do involve themselves in planning for social issues, it is often the directors who link business leaders and the police with “the fragmented world of social service agencies” and their advocates (2001, p. 127).

**Question 16: In your opinion, which of the following best describes the level of social service delivery in your organization's territory?**

This question asks participants to comment on the level of social service delivery in the BIA territory and was developed from personal experiences investigating the impacts of a “concentration” of social services in one area of a city. The belief upheld by one Metro Vancouver BIA was that a high level of social service provision in the area attracted more problematic social issues that hindered the revitalization of the area. In testing, this question produced some of the most interesting responses with manifest implications for the urban planning profession. Responses to this question are coded in the standard single-selection multiple choice style.
**Question 17: Which phrase best describes how your BIA views social issues as they relate to the economic objectives of the organization?**

With respect to the research question, this is undoubtedly the most direct question on the survey. The question is designed to provide the participant with a clear and easy means to indicate the relevance of the research topic for their particular organization. There are four possible responses and they are coded in the standard method for single-selection multiple choice questions. Also, because the directness of the question, it produced interesting results when analyzed against other questions. Due to its inclusion as part of the more novel aspect of the research project, there exists no direct precedence in the literature. The concept for the question was first drawn from personal volunteer experience but was also informed through the literature review and later revised during pilot testing.

**Evolution**

The short Evolution section contains three questions. Two of the questions produce data on how the BIA territory and mission have changed over time and the final question asks the participant to speculate about the future role of BIAs.

**Question 18: Which phrase best describes the change in the physical territory of the BIA since its inception?**

Coding for this question follows the standard single-selection multiple choice format. Data collected here was useful to categorize BIAs in order to compare how service and program provision for social issues changes as the organization grows. This question was adapted from surveys conducted by Hoyt (2005c, 2006 & 2008) and Mitchell (1999 & 2001) and their research along with Levy (2001) demonstrates that BIA service and program provision tends to evolve with the organization.

**Question 19: Which of the following best describes how the organization’s central mission has changed since its inception?**

Coding the responses to this question follows the pattern established above. Mitchell (2001) indicates that BIAs generally describe their mission in economic terms and the idea of providing a clean and safe area is generally about as close as they get to including social issues in their
mission. In preliminary conversations, two Executive Directors (of BIAs outside the research area) spoke of the process of evolving mandates, recognizing that the central mission of the BIA is constantly changing. One Executive Director discussed the idea of “mission creep,” relating that the Board of Directors—often community leaders with an interest in social issues—sometimes sway the direction of BIA programs or services even though this change may not be officially noted in the overall mission. Responses to this question are compared with responses from Questions 10 and 11, which seek to examine the BIA involvement in service areas and social issues.

Question 20: In your opinion, which of the following best describes the future role for your organization with respect to social planning advocacy?

This is a multiple choice question with four options; the participant is asked to choose the one that best describes their organization. Responses are coded using the standard coding system for single-selection multiple choice questions. The justification for including this question comes from both the literature and my own volunteer experiences. First, Mitchell (1999 & 2001) suggests that advocacy in a general sense is an important role for BIAs. Also, in a survey of BIAs in several different countries, Hoyt (2004) found that over half of the Canadian BIAs surveyed considered their organization ‘very involved’ in policy advocacy. Second, from my own experiences, advocacy is prioritized as a component of the BIA organizational structure. And, considering that BIAs are rather uniquely positioned among the public, private, and voluntary sectors of the economy, it makes sense that advocacy is recognized as a means of influencing economic objectives and social outcomes. Cross-tabulating responses for this question with indicators that the literature review and my personal experiences suggest could be associated with the BIA perception of social issues (such as the BIA budget and size, staff numbers, or involvement in services) offers an interesting perspective on how the BIA role may evolve in the future.

2.2.4 Conducting the Survey

Once the survey instrument was tested, revised, and finalized, the next step in the research design was to make initial contact with the Executive Directors of each of the 32 BIAs in the population. The Executive Directors were contacted through email; the email message (see: Appendix C – Sample Contact Email) contained a brief summary of the research project, an
official Letter of Information, and instructions on how to complete and submit the survey. The survey was attached to the email as a PDF document. The survey form was created with LiveCycle Designer software and appeared to the participants as a fillable Adobe file—the form allowed participants to save or print their responses before submitting the form electronically. Once submitted, survey responses were returned to the researcher as raw data (in .xml file format) through email. Data were then imported directly into an SPSS spreadsheet for analysis and also converted back into the original survey form to be saved and printed as an official record and for data verification purposes.

A multimode system of conducting the survey was employed to minimize non-response. To explain, contact was made first through email to express the research purpose and request the participants set aside time to complete and submit the survey. In the event of non-response after two weeks, a subsequent email was sent as a reminder. If still no reply was received within one week, phone calls were made (leaving a message if the individual was unavailable) in order to confirm receipt of the email and again request the participant complete and submit the form. In, Survey Research Methods, Floyd J. Fowler notes that in conducting a survey the multimode system allows researchers to contact a wider range of the target sample, including those who may be inaccessible with a single mode or less motivated in general (2009). With respect to data comparability, identical survey forms were used throughout the data collection phases.

2.2.5 Survey Response Rate

The response rate for the survey is 59 percent (19 responses from the population of 32 BIAs; Figure 2.1 maps the location of the 19 respondent BIAs). Although every effort was made to get a response from the Executive Directors of each of the BIAs, in survey research it is understood that some level of non-response is unavoidable. In, Handling Nonresponse in Social Science Research, the authors discuss different types of non-response in survey research and note non-response can pose a threat to external validity (Lindner, Murphy & Briers, 2001). In this case, however, and considering the uniqueness of Vancouver’s progressive social policies, research findings are not necessarily meant to be generalizable beyond the region. Thus, a response rate of 59 percent still provides adequate data to begin examining the research questions. Furthermore,

10 During the follow-up stages to the initial contact, careful attention was paid to avoid the use of any language (written or oral) that could be perceived as harassing or as causing nuisance in any way.
because the research project seeks to highlight emerging roles for BIAs with respect to the amelioration of social issues, the survey data is essentially used to inform a theoretical framework to address the research questions and the effects of non-response error are only minimally significant.

Time constraints posed the most significant factor affecting the response rate in two ways. First, the survey data collection phase was limited to 42 days; and, second, it ran from December 20th, 2010 to January 31st, 2011. Ideally, in order to increase the response rate, the survey could be conducted at a more appropriate time of the year when participants are less likely to be taking holidays. Devoting more time to follow up contacts would also increase the response rate. Such time constraints often accompany graduate research and the unfortunate matter is that applying deadlines to the data collection phase was a necessary procedure to assure the project was completed on time. The timing of the survey distribution, though not ideal, was rationalized by extending the response period by two weeks to allow more time for BIA directors to catch up with their work following the holidays.

Recall at the initial stage of the research design, the population of BIAs were stratified into Vancouver City BIAs (VC: N = 20) and Outer Municipality BIAs (OM: N = 12). Nine responses were received from VC BIAs and ten from OM BIAs. The VC response rate is 45 percent and the OM response rate is 83 percent. The responses for both strata are taken as representative samples in order to analyze the research question. A high response rate for the OM stratum controls for the variation in social policies among the seven different municipalities represented in the grouping. Although witnessing a lower response rate, the VC stratum is taken as a representative sample because each BIA in the grouping is located in the same municipality and thus there is no variation in municipal social policy among the BIAs.

2.3 Analysis of Survey Responses

The purpose of this study is to detail how BIAs in Metro Vancouver perceive social issues as part of their economic objectives. The report is also interested in the factors that may motivate a BIA to take on more social responsibility: factors such as municipal social policy, BIA budget, or the socioeconomic climate of the BIA territory, for example. In order to accomplish these objectives, survey responses were first categorized by strata and then a database was constructed in order to compare responses across all BIAs. In addition to the survey responses, PCensus data
for each of the respondent BIAs was added to the database to provide a neighbourhood contextual element to the analysis. The data are from the 2006 Canada Census and are derived from one kilometre circles extending from the centre of the BIA territory (see: Appendix D – Circle File Latitudes and Longitudes). PCensus data was collected on average household income, unemployment rate, and the number of families by prevalence of low income. These indicators are linked to income disparities and, by extension, poverty issues. Thus, they are seen to provide a rough proxy for the socioeconomic status of an area. In a 2005 study of BIAs in low- and high-income neighbourhoods in New York, Jill Simone Gross “used household income, number of individuals in poverty, median rent paid, and the number of individuals in the labor force as indicators of wealth and poverty” (2005, p. 176).

The methodology used to generate the overview of neighbourhood socioeconomic levels is adapted from David Ley and Cory Dobson (2008). For this report, statistics for each indicator are first divided into quartiles. The first quartile represents the highest or best order of the indicator (i.e. highest average household income, lowest unemployment rate, and the fewest number of families by prevalence of low income). Next, the indicators are compiled collectively based on quartile rankings and organized by subsample. The results of this methodology produce statistics that illustrate the frequency of BIA occurrences in areas of generally higher and lower socioeconomic levels.

The survey response database was constructed by compiling responses using Adobe Acrobat Pro software and then importing the data into an SPSS spreadsheet. The development of an electronic survey compatible with data analysis software increased the ease of tracking, compiling, and analyzing survey responses. To assure a high level of reliability throughout the research design, each step in the methodological procedures used in the data collection phases is carefully documented and these procedures are carried over to the data analysis phase. Yin suggests that making each step in the procedure operational goes a long way in establishing researcher trust and reliability (2009).

The data analysis began once the database was completed. To begin, basic summary statistics such as frequency tables were compiled to produce an overview of all BIAs. Next, the database was used to conduct bivariate descriptive data analysis including cross-tabulations. The analysis
of survey responses sought to draw out emerging themes or patterns that could contribute to the development of theory or illustrate emerging roles for BIAs.

2.4 Limitations

Although there are several advantages to using an electronic survey such as distributing it to the entire population of BIAs rather than a smaller sample or the relative ease of compiling survey responses, there also exist a few notable limitations of electronic survey research. Electronic surveys, for instance, are self-administered and this presents two research limitations: the BIA email contact information is often a general address and, even though the Executive Director was specifically requested to complete the form to assure research consistency, there is no way to ascertain who completed the survey. Self-administered surveys also lack the element of quality control with respect to survey completion or question and response clarity (Fowler, 2009). In this research project, however, several stages of editing and pilot testing the survey instrument with professionals led to the creation of a carefully designed survey form that should downplay such limitations.

This report also accepts a level of researcher limitation. As an individual conducting the research project, the onus for data verification falls onto one set of shoulders and thus lacks the reliability a research team could provide. Moreover, one individual functioning under the considerable time constraints typical of graduate research is forced to impose deadlines that would otherwise allow for, say, a more aggressive data collection phase, as just one example.

The research project faces limitations in terms of its scope and scale, too. Because the study only surveys BIAs in Metro Vancouver, and the City of Vancouver maintains progressive social policies, the findings from this study are made difficult to compare with other cities or be scaled-up to address the research questions on a national level. Although these limitations may be an unfortunate consequence of Vancouver’s unique stance on social issues, the study nonetheless presents an interesting account of the effect BIAs have on social issues in their immediate territories.
Chapter 3 Data Analysis and Findings
This chapter presents the results of the survey of BIA Executive Directors and the sample (N = 19) represents a population of 32 BIAs in Metro Vancouver (Vancouver City, hereafter VC, N = 20 and Outer Municipalities, hereafter OM, N = 12). The analysis commences at the broadest level of survey response data and focuses on the more specific details relevant to answering the research questions. Overall, the analysis is a comparison of Metro Vancouver BIAs and the factors that affect their perception of social issues. The analysis also seeks to determine how BIAs perceive social issues as interrelated in economic objectives and whether municipal social policies influence this relationship.

3.1 BIA Service Areas
The analysis of survey responses begins with an examination of eight BIA service areas: capital improvements, consumer marketing, economic development, maintenance, public space regulation, policy advocacy, security, and social services. The respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which their organizations are involved in the service areas and respond using a three-point scale: 1 = Very Involved, 2 = Somewhat Involved, and 3 = Not at all Involved. Mean values closer to 1.0 indicate a higher level of involvement in that particular service area, while mean values closer to 3.0 suggest a more limited involvement in the service area. Responses to the service area questions provide a general overview of BIA activities. In addition to the regional totals, responses are categorized by strata in order to address the research questions (as noted in Section 2.2.1).
Table 3.1 displays the average level of BIA involvement in service areas organized according to subsamples. The survey of 19 BIAs found that consumer marketing ($\bar{x} = 1.17$) is the service area in which BIAs in Metro Vancouver are most involved; this finding is similar across subsamples of VC BIAs ($\bar{x}_1 = 1.25$) and OM BIAs ($\bar{x}_2 = 1.10$). Consumer marketing generally involves planning festivals and events, coordinating sales promotions, and producing maps, brochures, and newsletters, among other activities. Again, looking at the total mean values for the Metro Vancouver region, policy advocacy ($\bar{x} = 1.47$), maintenance ($\bar{x} = 1.53$), security ($\bar{x} = 1.58$), capital improvements ($\bar{x} = 1.68$), and economic development ($\bar{x} = 1.95$) also see mean levels of BIA involvement less than 2.0 indicating the service area is generally regarded as important to the operations of BIAs. BIAs in Metro Vancouver only slightly less often tread into the provision of social services and the regulation of public spaces. Overall, all eight of the service areas see some level of attention from BIAs, but it is worth taking a closer look at the differences between the VC and OM strata.
Table 3.1 Average level of BIA involvement in service areas by strata location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank / Service Area</th>
<th>Mean Level of Involvement in Service Areas and Standard Deviation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver City (VC) (N = 9)</td>
<td>Outer Municipality (OM) (N = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}_1$, Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}_2$, Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Consumer marketing</td>
<td>1.25, 0.46</td>
<td>1.10, 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Policy advocacy</td>
<td>1.22, 0.67</td>
<td>1.70, 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maintenance</td>
<td>1.22, 0.44</td>
<td>1.80, 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Security</td>
<td>1.44, 0.53</td>
<td>1.70, 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Capital improvements</td>
<td>1.78, 0.67</td>
<td>1.60, 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Economic development</td>
<td>2.22, 0.67</td>
<td>1.70, 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Social services</td>
<td>1.89, 0.60</td>
<td>2.20, 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Public space regulation</td>
<td>2.11, 0.60</td>
<td>2.30, 0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level

Interestingly, VC BIAs surveyed were more likely to be involved in the provision of social services ($\bar{x}_1 = 1.89$) than OM BIAs ($\bar{x}_2 = 2.20$). Although neither stratum is highly involved in social services, the difference is notable with respect to the research questions and is investigated further in Section 3.1.1. Also, where OM BIAs see more involvement in economic development service areas ($\bar{x}_2 = 1.70$), Vancouver BIAs are least likely to be active ($\bar{x}_1 = 2.22$). The level of BIA involvement in economic development services may seem surprising considering the primary objectives of BIAs. Mitchell (1999), for instance, surveyed 264 BIDs (BIAs) in the United States and found that 25 percent are very involved in economic development. In Canada, however, Hoyt (2005c) surveyed 92 BIAs in Canada and found that only 4 percent of BIAs are very involved in economic development. The difference of means between VC and OM BIAs noted in Table 3.1 are statistically significant for economic development ($P = 0.073$) and maintenance ($P = 0.099$) service areas at the 90 percent confidence level.\(^\text{11}\) Put differently, VC BIAs are more likely to be involved in service areas related to maintenance and OM BIAs are more likely to be involved in economic development programs.

In general, comparing the data suggest other differences may also exist between VC and OM BIAs such as with policy advocacy (mean difference = 0.48; $P = 0.181$) and social services

\(^{11}\) Generally the standard confidence level for social science research is considered 95 percent. The differences of means noted in Table 3.1, however, are not statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level.
(mean difference = 0.31; $P = 0.345$). The mean differences noted in Table 3.1 that are negative indicates a higher level of involvement in these service areas for VC BIAs. Although the sample size is small and these differences are not statistically significant, it does provide general insight into the tendencies of BIAs in each stratum. Information about the tendencies of BIAs in the subsamples helps to guide further analysis of survey responses.

The standard deviations for level of involvement in service area responses, as displayed in Table 3.1, indicate the level of variance among BIAs. Generally this variance is higher for OM BIAs, keep in mind that with a small sample size, one outlier can skew the results. However, if municipal policies indeed influence how BIAs perceive social issues and, by extension, respond to them, then it would be likely to see more variation with OM BIAs. VC BIAs all function within one set of municipal policies whereas OM BIAs each operate under unique municipal policy structures. The ten OM BIAs in the sample represent seven different municipalities. BIAs are small, localized geographic territories with limited resources with which to be involved in a wide range of service areas and some level of variance should be expected. Ultimately, it is inconclusive whether variance among subsamples is solely a factor of the small sample size or if it is the result of the BIAs operating within seven different municipal policy structures.

### 3.1.1 Involvement in Social Services

The survey instrument asked participants to indicate the degree to which their organization is involved in social services. Participants were prompted to consider *aiding the homeless, providing job training, and supplying youth services* as a guide to reflect on their organization’s level of involvement in social services. Table 3.2 displays the frequency of BIA involvement in social services by strata. In the VC stratum, 89 percent of BIAs sampled were either *very involved* or *somewhat involved* in social services; in the OM stratum 60 percent of BIAs had either very or some level of involvement in social services. Also, 26 percent of BIAs were not at all involved in social services.

---

12 Given the small sample size two OM BIAs in exurban areas consistently appear as outliers in the data. These survey responses were included in the data pool in order to respect the variable characteristics of BIAs in general.

13 Throughout this report the phrase “some level of involvement” is used to indicate a grouping of BIAs that classified their level of involvement as either *Very involved* or *Somewhat involved*, as opposed to *Not at all involved*. 
Table 3.2 Level of involvement in social services by strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social services</th>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Vancouver City (VC)</th>
<th>Outer Municipality (OM)</th>
<th>Total (N = 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within VC</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within VC</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within VC</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within VC</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Altogether 14 of the 19 BIAs surveyed claimed some level of involvement in social services. The survey asked participants to consider the original reasons why their BIA was created. There are six possible selections for participants to consider and they may choose all that apply to their organization. Two of the options are closely linked to social issues: ‘to implement revitalization efforts’ and ‘to deal with encroaching social issues.’ An examination of the 14 BIAs with some level of involvement in social services shows 12 declared that one of the reasons for creating the BIA was in order to implement revitalization efforts; nine declared one of the reasons was to deal with encroaching social issues.¹⁴

¹⁴ BIAs could select multiple responses when responding to the question concerning the reason(s) for their creation. Due to missing values on the survey responses, the reason(s) for BIA creation can only be examined for 13 of the 14 BIAs that claim some level of involvement in social services.
BIAs created to implement revitalization efforts or deal with encroaching social issues would likely be attuned to social planning causes. However, as Table 3.3 shows, only four BIAs created for either or both of these reasons are very involved in social services; nine are somewhat involved and five are not at all involved. This finding illustrates that even though BIAs are created for reasons relevant to social planning objectives, they are limited in their ability to respond to social issues through a strong commitment to social servicing. Thus, BIAs in Metro Vancouver perceive social issues as intertwined in economic objectives, but their role in addressing social issues is not typically focused on social services. Put differently, the BIAs in Metro Vancouver that recognize the importance of social issues typically find other means to address the issues aside from being involved in social services.

Additionally, BIAs expressly formed to deal with encroaching social issues display an interesting finding when examined in light of the period of BIA creation. In BC, BIA enabling legislation passed in 1989. Analyzing BIA responses in two groups—those formed up to and including 1999
and those formed afterwards—shows only 30 percent of the BIAs surveyed in the earlier period were created to deal with encroaching social issues. In the period since then, 75 percent of the BIAs formed indicate encroaching social issues as a reason for their creation. Even taken as a mild trend in the reasons for BIA creation, these statistics may signal the emergence of BIAs as a broad tool to address economic and social development issues. If an increasing number of BIAs are being formed to deal with encroaching social issues, and some but not all are doing so through the direct provision of social services, what type of involvement do the majority of BIAs seek who cannot afford the financial and human resources necessary to be directly involved in social services? Section 3.4 suggests possible answers to this question. Before then it is helpful to examine the level of social service delivery in BIA territories—a factor that background research indicates may be pivotal in how a BIA perceives social issues as integral to economic objectives.

3.1.2 Level of Social Service Delivery

BIAs form in areas of economic significance in the city (Hernandez & Jones, 2005). Typically these areas are centrally located and highly accessible. Likewise, social service agencies and organizations tend to locate in areas of the city where their clientele can easily access the services. Thus there is often an overlap between areas of the city with higher levels of social service provision and BIA territories. The extent to which high levels of social service provisions affect BIA objectives is debateable (Schaal, 2010). The level of social service delivery in BIA territories, however, proves to be an interesting statistic when the subsamples are examined independently.

Each Executive Director was asked, in their own opinion, to describe the level of social service delivery in their organization’s territory (see Table 3.4). Seven of the 19 respondents (37 percent) indicated that their BIA territory has a very high or high level of social service delivery. Five of the aforementioned BIAs described the level of service delivery as very high—and, interestingly enough, these BIAs are all located in the OM stratum (the remaining two BIAs claim a high level and are located in the VC stratum). Moreover, these five OM BIAs represent half of the OM respondents and 42 percent of the total population of OM BIAs. The fact that half of the respondent OM BIAs perceived a very high level of existing social service delivery in their territories may also explain why fewer of them are involved in social services as discussed in the
preceding sections. More to the point, if half the OM BIAs perceive the level of social service delivery in their territory as very high and these areas indeed have higher levels of social services, which, it can generally be accepted, means there exists high occurrences of social issues in the area, then, by extension, it also implies OM BIAs are keenly aware of social issues in the area. Ultimately, this speaks to the overall level of the BIA perception of social issues and factors into the question of how VC and OM BIAs perceive social issues differently.

Table 3.4 Level of social service delivery by strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of social service delivery in area</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total (N = 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count (Vancouver City (VC))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (Outer Municipality (OM))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, 78 percent of the VC BIA sample indicates the level of social service delivery in their territory is either average or low compared to 40 percent for OM BIAs. Recall VC BIAs tend to be slightly more involved in social service delivery which stands to reason they are likely to be as aware of the level of social service delivery in the area as OM BIAs, but, interestingly, perceive the level of service delivery differently than OM BIAs. Assuming the actual level of social service delivery in VC BIA territories is indeed lower than OM BIAs (as the findings presented in Table 3.4 might suggest), it still prods the question: why do VC BIAs perceive social issues differently than OM BIAs? At this point in the analysis it appears VC BIAs take a

---

15 This is generally accepted not to be the case. Key informant interviews conducted for “What Future Lives Here?” (Schaal, 2010) suggest Vancouver and other municipalities north of the Fraser River receive more education, transportation, and social services per capita than municipalities outside of Vancouver, particularly those south of the Fraser River.
more integrative approach to addressing social issues and economic objectives. VC BIAs do tend to be more involved in social services. On the other hand, half of the OM BIAs may perceive the level of social services (the indicator) as very high in their territories because they regard social issues (the outcome) as obstacles to achieving their economic objectives. Hoyt (2005a) establishes the historical connection between social disorder and economic objectives in “Do Business Improvement District Organizations Make a Difference?” Certainly the types of social services in the area are a factor that is not addressed in this report, but the perception of the level of social service delivery alone indicates a difference between how VC and OM BIAs perceive social issues.

3.2 Social Issues

This section of the analysis examines the BIA perception of the 12 social issues presented on the survey.

3.2.1 Persistence of Social Issues

The analysis of social issues begins with an investigation into the persistence of social issues in BIA territories. Respondents are asked to rank the five most persistent social issues they deal with based on the number of complaints or concerns they receive from BIA members (business and property owners). They are given the option of ranking up to five social issues from the list beginning with the first most persistent issue. Table 3.5 displays the collective results from the survey responses without regard for the order in which the issues were ranked. The table is organized by subsamples and the total column indicates how many times the social issue was selected as a persistent area of complaint or concern for BIA members.
Table 3.5 Most persistent social issues based on member complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issues</th>
<th>Vancouver City (VC)</th>
<th>Outer Municipality (OM)</th>
<th>Total (N = 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property theft</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug dealing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squeegee kids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across the Metro Vancouver region property theft (83.3 percent), panhandling (72.2 percent) and vandalism (72.2 percent) rank as the most persistent social issues. Homelessness (61.1 percent) and drug dealing (50 percent) round out the five most persistent issues. Altogether, the general pattern of complaints from members about social issues is similar between the strata. When analyzed collectively the most persistent social issues for VC BIAs are correlated with those of the OM BIAs (i.e. social issues with high counts of persistence in VC BIAs occur with social issues with high counts of persistence in OM BIAs). Interestingly, it is only when each stratum is examined independently with particular respect to the rankings assigned to each response rather than as a collective set of responses that differences between Vancouver BIAs and outer municipality BIAs are revealed.

In fact, when examined in light of the rankings the most persistent social issues in each stratum are inconsistent with the collective totals for the metropolitan region. That is, neither property theft nor panhandling rank as the first most persistent issue in the individual strata. Half of the OM BIAs surveyed rank homelessness as the first most persistent issue and 44 percent of VC BIAs rank vandalism as the first most persistent issue. For comparison, only 12.5 percent of BIAs in the OM stratum rank vandalism as the first most persistent issue and only 11 percent of BIAs in the VC stratum rank homelessness as the first most persistent issue. Thus, even though property theft and panhandling rank as more persistent areas of complaint across the region collectively without regard for the order in which the issues are ranked, stratification indicates
there exists a noticeable difference between how BIA members perceive social issues in Vancouver compared to outer municipalities.

That homelessness is so persistently an area of complaint or concern for OM BIAs would no doubt lead them to perceive the issue as a barrier in achieving their economic objectives. The fact vandalism ranks as the first most persistent social issue in VC BIAs based on member complaints, and homelessness—though certainly a serious issue in the city—does not rank highly as a persistent issue suggests there are indeed differences between how VC and OM BIA members perceive social issues. Consider also that homelessness is an issue served by a range of social services including general health and mental health services, addictions, housing, employment and policing services whereas vandalism is not typically served by any. Thus, if homelessness is indeed a persistent social issue in OM BIAs, it stands to reason they would perceive a higher level of social service delivery in their territories as were the findings in Section 3.1.2. The Greater Vancouver Regional Steering Committee on Homelessness conducts homeless counts every three years, however, and the results from the 2008 homeless count found 59 percent of the region’s homeless population in Vancouver as well as 71 percent of the region’s shelter spaces (GVRSCH, 2010). In other words, Vancouver deals with a more substantial homelessness issue, but its BIAs appear to have a higher level of acceptance for homelessness services.

Even though the sample size is small the ranking of persistence of social issues indicates a basic difference between VC and OM BIAs. Keep in mind that the rankings as reported are filtered through the respective lenses of BIA Executive Directors and each director brings with them a different personal background, level of interest in or concern for social causes, connection to the public and voluntary sectors that participate in social planning and the provision of social services and, of course, each director must work within the limitations imposed by staff sizes, budget amounts, and board directives (see Section 2.4 for a discussion of survey limitations). The point is there are myriad possible explanations or causes for the noted differences among BIAs and as of yet it is difficult to claim that municipal social policies may lead to the differences noted. Nonetheless the differences warrant further investigation. The question still unanswered is why the two strata display differences in terms of how they perceive social issues as part of their economic objectives.
3.2.2 Relevance of social issues to BIA management

Question 11 on the survey instrument is the most direct question to examine how social issues are perceived as intertwined in BIA economic objectives. The question asks participants to indicate the extent they consider the 12 aforementioned social issues as relevant to their management of a BIA. Participants respond using a three-point scale: 1 = Very Significant, 2 = Somewhat Significant, and 3 = Not Significant. Mean values nearer 1.0 indicate the social issue has a higher level of relevance. As mean values increase from 2.0 to 3.0, the respective social issue can be seen as becoming less relevant in the management of BIAs in the sample. Table 3.6 displays the mean values and standard deviations for each of the 12 social issues organized by rank of relevance and strata.

Table 3.6 Mean perception of social issues as relevant to BIA management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issues</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Difference of Means (VC - OM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property theft</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.78*</td>
<td>0.833*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug dealing</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Violence</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squegee kids</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T denotes tie, * N = 9

There are six social issues consistently seen as concerns relevant to the management of BIAs across the region: property theft (\( \bar{x} = 1.32 \)), vandalism (\( \bar{x} = 1.37 \)), homelessness (\( \bar{x} = 1.63 \)), substance abuse (\( \bar{x} = 1.72 \)), drug dealing (\( \bar{x} = 1.79 \)), and panhandling (\( \bar{x} = 1.79 \)). The remaining six social issues are less consistently seen as relevant issues. In Table 3.6, the Rank and Difference of Means columns provide clues as to how VC BIAs differ from OM BIAs in terms of their perception of social issues as relevant to the management of the organization. The
order of the rankings for the OM BIAs follows precisely the order of means for the Metro Vancouver region as a whole. VC BIAs, on the other hand, see some differences from the region in terms of how social issues are ranked, namely the issues of drug dealing, panhandling, and street vending. Negative numbers in the Difference of Means column indicate the social issue is seen as more relevant in VC BIAs than OM BIAs. Nine of the 12 social issues are considered more relevant in VC BIAs. The three social issues considered more relevant in OM BIAs are only slightly so much so, and in fact the difference of means are not statistically significant.

Of the nine social issues considered more relevant to VC BIAs, five stand out as having the greatest differences of means: panhandling (0.66 mean difference), street vendors (0.56), vandalism (0.49), drug dealing (0.44), and property theft (0.39). Three of these social issues are statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level: street vendors ($P = 0.013$), panhandling ($P = 0.064$), and vandalism ($P = 0.07$). Put differently, the differences in means between VC and OM BIAs for these three social issues are not likely to have occurred by chance. VC BIAs thus perceive street vending, panhandling, and vandalism as more relevant social issues compared to OM BIAs.
Street vending and panhandling are issues generally most common where there are substantial concentrations of people, so it is understandable VC BIAs should deal with these issues more readily—Vancouver does, after all, have greater employment and population densities. The City of Vancouver has a history of confronting panhandling issues head on such as the now repealed by-law no. 7885, which prohibited panhandling at night and in several areas of the public domain. As of 2004, provincial legislation guides panhandling policies through the *Safe Streets Act*. Municipal policy may however affect how VC BIAs perceive street vending as relevant in the management of their organization. Recent policy changes in Vancouver, for instance, now encourage street vending as a means of enhancing the social and cultural vitality of life on the sidewalks and public spaces. The perception of vandalism in VC BIAs is discussed in Section 3.4.

---

3.2.3 Neighbourhood Indicators

Table 3.7 provides an overview of the general socioeconomic status of BIA territories. The three indicators used are: average household income, unemployment rate, and the number of families by prevalence of low income (see: Section 2.3). Recall the first quartile represents the highest or best order of the indicator (i.e. highest average household income, lowest unemployment rate, and the fewest number of families by prevalence of low income). The indicators are compiled collectively for all BIAs but are organized by subsample. Because this analysis uses three indicators, each of the 19 BIAs in the sample receives three quartile rankings for a total count of 57 BIA quartile rankings.

Table 3.7 Quartile rankings of neighbourhood indicators by strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Neighbourhood indicators</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Outer Municipality (N = 10)</th>
<th>Total count in quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First quartile</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within row</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within row</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within row</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within row</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of BIAs</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis indicate OM BIAs typically operate in areas with higher socioeconomic levels. For instance, 10 OM BIAs are located in first quartile areas compared to only four VC BIAs. In other words, over 70 percent of BIAs in the first quartile, or, properly enough, what could be considered as the top tier of neighbourhoods (based on the general income-related indicators), are outer municipality BIAs. On the other hand, a majority of the BIAs in the third and fourth quartiles are located in Vancouver. Nine VC BIAs, for example, display fourth quartile rankings compared to only four OM BIAs.
If VC BIAs typically operate in areas with lower socioeconomic levels, it provides a rationale for their increased perception of social issues and higher involvement in social services. Likewise, if OM BIAs typically operate in areas with higher socioeconomic levels, it would explain why they are generally less involved in social services. It would not explain, however, why OM BIAs generally perceive a higher level of social service delivery in their territories, assuming of course that social services locate where they are most needed (i.e. in areas with lower socioeconomic levels). Similarly, Gross, in her 2005 study of BIDs in high- and low-income neighbourhoods of New York City, found that about 20 percent of BIDs in lower income areas provided social services whereas BIDs in higher income neighbourhoods did not.

3.3 Social Issues and Economic Objectives

Table 3.8 shows how BIAs view social issues as related to their economic objectives in consideration of the period when the BIA was established. As mentioned in Section 3.1.1, for the analysis BIAs were divided into two time periods based on the year of their legal establishment. Of the BIAs formed since 2000, 62.5 percent view social issues as impinging on economic objectives. All eight, or 100 percent, of the BIAs formed since 2000 perceive social issues as impinging on economic objectives or as relevant but secondary to economic objectives. In other words, all of the more recently formed BIAs perceive social issues as related to their economic objectives to some degree, compared to 70 percent of BIAs in the earlier period. Overall, 18 BIAs responded to the question and of those only three (16.7 percent) view social issues as not affecting their economic objectives or as not significant to their BIA.
Table 3.8 Period of BIA establishment by view of social issues and economic objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year legally established</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Social issues impinge on economic objectives</th>
<th>Social issues are relevant but secondary to economic objectives</th>
<th>Social issues do not affect our economic objectives</th>
<th>Social issues are not significant to our BIA</th>
<th>Total (N = 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 to 1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Year legally est.</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Year legally est.</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Year legally est.</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the BIAAs formed in the earlier period, between the years 1989 to 1999 inclusively, only two BIAAs (20 percent) feel social issues impinge on their economic objectives. Moreover, 30 percent think social issues do not affect their economic objectives or are not significant to their BIA. These statistics are interesting to note because they counter the original assumption that older and more established BIAAs gradually evolve to take a more active approach to address social issues. Contrary to the perspective that BIA mandates evolve over time, these findings point to an evolution in the municipal perception of BIAAs. Put differently, the fact all eight of the more recently established BIAAs consider social issues as impinging on or relevant but secondary to economic objectives suggests the municipalities that authorize their formation may well recognize BIAAs as a fundamental community and economic development tool.

3.4 BIA Programs, Services, and Advocacy directed at Social Issues

The programs, services, or advocacy that BIAAs undertake with respect to social issues is a key indicator of how the organizations perceive the issues as interwoven in their economic objectives. BIAAs, of course, deal with social issues in a number of different ways and the purpose here is not necessarily to compare BIA program, service, or advocacy responses across Metro Vancouver, but, rather, to get a general sense of the level and types of BIA reactions to social issues. The social issues that BIAAs declared significant to their organizations were examined previously (see Section 3.2.2). In recognition of the fact that declaring a social issue as significant is quite another thing from initiating or participating in a response to the issue, this
section describes the activities BIAs typically undertake to address social issues in their territories.

Question 12 on the survey instrument asks participants to reflect on the social issues they previously identified as *very significant* and describe specific programs, services, or advocacy they undertake to address those issues. An examination of the responses reveals patterns in how BIAs are active in addressing social issues. Table 3.6 previously showed that across the region six of the 12 social issues presented on the survey tend to be considered more substantial: property theft, vandalism, homelessness, substance abuse, drug dealing, and panhandling. The remaining six social issues are less frequently noted as constituting relevant issues, if at all. As a result no general program, service, or advocacy themes emerge for the following issues: unemployment, prostitution, adult literacy, gang violence, squeegee kids, and street vendors.

On average, BIAs indicate property theft is the most significant social issue across Metro Vancouver ($\bar{x} = 1.32$). BIAs address the issue of property theft almost exclusively through preventative measures. Crime prevention education, establishing working relationships with local police and providing security patrols are common program responses. Participants did not indicate they take an advocacy role with respect to the issue of property theft.

Across the region, vandalism, including graffiti ($\bar{x} = 1.37$) is the next most significant social issue affecting the management of BIAs. More VC BIAs declare vandalism and graffiti as significant issues compared to OM BIAs. The analysis of BIA responses indicates VC BIAs work closely with the city to report incidences of vandalism and graffiti. On the other hand, the fact that fewer OM BIAs declare vandalism and graffiti as significant issues suggests two possibilities: (i) it may be likely vandalism is a less common occurrence in these municipalities; or, more likely (ii) municipal policies and programs that target vandalism and graffiti are a factor in how BIAs respond to the issue. Vancouver’s graffiti by-law (by-law no. 7343) that prohibits graffiti and requires all property be kept free of graffiti may inspire VC BIAs to take a more active approach to the issue. Equally likely is the idea OM BIAs less consistently address the issue because each municipality approaches vandalism and graffiti uniquely—not all municipalities, for instance, enforce such rigid graffiti by-laws. Accordingly, the issue of vandalism and graffiti suggests municipal policies may well be a factor in how BIAs address social issues as part of their economic objectives.
Homelessness ($\bar{x} = 1.63$) and substance abuse ($\bar{x} = 1.72$) are two of the more consistently significant social issues across the metropolitan region. Put differently, both VC and OM BIAs indicate homelessness and substance abuse are significant issues relevant to the management of their organization. The BIA responses to these social issues are particularly interesting because homelessness and substance abuse are both complex and cross-jurisdictional problems often involving housing and health services, with legal implications as well. Not surprisingly, with these more complex social issues policy advocacy and collaboration with social service agencies and organizations are the primary means of response for BIAs. It remains to be seen whether these issues instigate more policy advocacy and collaboration on behalf of the BIAs because they are complex and cross-jurisdictional, or, frankly, because services that ameliorate the issues are too expensive for BIAs to address directly. What is clear, however, is that BIAs take an earnest advocacy role with respect to homelessness and substance abuse issues. It should also be noted that homelessness and substance abuse, unarguably, present substantial obstacles to achieving the economic objectives and business revitalization goals of BIAs. If business owners (68 percent) and property owners (21 percent) together account for 89 percent of the groups responsible for forming the organizations, and these owners are people with some level of political clout that clearly stand opposed to such severe social issues occurring in the BIA territory area, then it stands to reason that they would garner political support to influence municipal policies.

Drug dealing ($\bar{x} = 1.79$) and panhandling ($\bar{x} = 1.79$) are the next most significant social issues affecting the management of BIAs in Metro Vancouver. BIAs that deal with these social issues, whether they are VC or OM BIAs, almost exclusively establish partnerships or relationships with local police or community policing programs. Some BIAs employ private security agencies and others provide volunteer safety or security patrols to address aggressive panhandling and to inform the local police of drug dealing issues.

Overall, the survey responses indicate BIAs undertake policy advocacy, collaboration, and partnership building more regularly than any other means to address social issues in their territories. A complete analysis of the survey data confirms limited staff resources and budget constraints are the most likely factors that prevent BIAs from taking more active or operative responses to social issues. For instance, 79 percent of respondents indicate their organization’s
role in planning for social issues is limited by their budget and 74 percent claim staff and time limitations constrain their role. The average budget size is $370,346 (VC = $536,063 and OM $221,200). BIAs in Metro Vancouver have an average of 1.26 full-time employees each (median and mode = 1) and 0.89 part-time employees (median and mode = 1; N = 19 for all statistics noted).

All in all, like any other organization or enterprise, BIAs too must work within their means. And, the results here indicate policy advocacy is a likely response scenario for BIAs that operate with limited financial and human resources. Moreover, BIAs are uniquely positioned among the public, private, and voluntary sectors in the community which puts them in a strategically-favourable position to conduct policy advocacy. BIAs are uniquely positioned in that they represent private sector or business interests yet they are established through municipal by-law. Operating with public sector authorization and legitimization, it now appears BIAs are evolving to address more prominently the social issues that affect their economic objectives by taking an advocacy role—one that certainly benefits from this unique position in the community.

3.5 Summary of Analysis

On the whole, the analysis of the survey responses shows VC and OM BIAs display some relevant differences. In terms of service areas, BIAs across Metro Vancouver are typically all highly involved in consumer marketing, but OM BIAs are significantly more likely to be involved in economic development. VC BIAs are more likely to be involved in the provision of social services than OM BIAs. With that said, the survey findings still suggest BIAs are limited in their involvement in social services even though they generally perceive social issues as relevant to their organizations. Even BIAs created to deal with encroaching social issues are not overwhelming involved in the provision of social services.

Compared to VC BIAs, OM BIAs typically claim their territories have higher levels of social service delivery. Neighbourhood factors, however, suggest OM BIAs generally operate in areas of their respective communities with indications of higher socioeconomic levels. Conversely, VC BIAs do not perceive such high levels of social service delivery in their territories but typically operate in areas of lower socioeconomic levels—areas where conventional wisdom would suggest actually require higher levels of social services. Accordingly, VC BIAs might be seen to be more accepting of social service provisions.
BIAs across the Metro Vancouver region generally perceive social issues in a similar fashion. That is, property theft, vandalism, homelessness, substance abuse, drug dealing, and panhandling are all perceived as issues more relevant in the management of Metro Vancouver BIAs than the remaining six social issues. Three social issues, however, were identified that VC BIAs perceive as more relevant to their BIAs than OM BIAs: street vending, panhandling, and vandalism. Moreover, municipal policies may, interestingly enough, influence the VC BIA perception of these issues. All in all, the results of the survey analysis point to differences between VC and OM BIAs and the following chapter discusses possible explanations and implications for the differences noted.
Chapter 4 Recommendations and Conclusion
Considerations for the Future of BIAs

The purpose of this report has been to determine how BIAs in Metro Vancouver perceive social issues as interrelated in economic objectives. The analysis of survey responses indicates that both VC and OM BIAs typically show an interest in social issues. This research project also illustrates that BIAs are advancing policy advocacy as a service area, particularly BIAs that consider social issues relevant to the management of their organization. Although BIAs are uniquely positioned to take an advocacy role, the municipalities that authorize their formation need to take into account the fact BIAs lack democratic representation in their policy positions. On the other hand, BIAs do represent the organized voice of business interests and municipalities that compete for limited provincial funding stand to benefit from BIAs advocating for remedies for social and economic issues that manifest at the municipal level yet require programs and services otherwise dependent on funds allocated through provincial authorities. Finally, provincial legislation authorizes municipal councils to create BIAs, so ultimately the future direction of BIAs in BC rests with the province. The emerging role of policy advocacy for BIAs, especially with respect to social issues, in combination with the province’s ambitions to foster social innovation, represents an ideal opportunity to enable BIAs to function as agents of social change. Thus, this report culminates with three recommendations to help guide the future direction of BIAs in BC. The recommendations are from the perspective of BIAs, municipal governments and, lastly, the provincial government.

1. BIAs should extend their policy advocacy positions when social issues are prioritized.

The analysis of the survey responses suggests policy advocacy is both a common approach as well as an emerging tool for BIAs to address social issues. Because policy advocacy is already a common BIA approach to deal with a range of issues and over half of the BIAs in the sample (55 percent) indicated that their role with respect to social planning advocacy would remain somewhat stable into the future,17 it goes without saying that BIAs consider policy advocacy a fundamental tactic in pursuing their respective agendas. Furthermore, a third of the BIAs in the sample indicated their BIA will play a more significant role in the future with respect to social

17 Participants were also given the option of indicating their organization would play a less significant role in the future or that their organization neither currently nor plans to play an advocacy role to any degree.
planning advocacy. Taken together, these statistics demonstrate that some BIAs extend their policy advocacy positions to encompass social planning goals in addition to their economic programs.

Interestingly, 83 percent of the BIAs that anticipate a more significant role in the future with respect to social planning advocacy also indicate they are already very involved in policy advocacy as a service area. Not only is this a telling indication of the relative strength and significance of the advocacy position, but it signals the emergence of advocacy specifically aimed at social planning goals. In other words, although policy advocacy is not exactly providing a service per se, BIAs perceive the policy advocacy role or position as a form of involvement in social services, even if their involvement does nothing directly to ameliorate social issues. Extending the advocacy position by establishing partnerships and pursuing co-leadership approaches within the community is ultimately a natural progression for BIAs that prioritize social issues.

Policy advocacy is also an equal opportunity tool in that even BIAs with the most severe human and financial resource limitations are able to take advocacy positions, which explains the generally high level of BIA involvement in advocacy in the first place. Thus, when BIAs must deal with areas of concentrated poverty or areas that experience a sufficiency of social issues, policy advocacy is the most economically-feasible approach. The question that is unfortunately left unanswered in this inquiry is exactly what kind of advocacy BIAs should undertake. Should they advocate, for instance, for more and improved human and social services in their territories? Or, conversely, should they advocate for the removal or dispersal of services that are perceived as impinging on economic objectives by attracting individuals deemed undesirable? Interestingly, and by no means conclusively, this report suggests VC BIAs likely advocate for the former and OM BIAs the latter. Whether this tendency is accurate and whether it is the result of municipal social policies is a matter for a more focused, in-depth case study analysis.

2. Municipalities that foster BIAs as economic development tools should consider how BIAs are involved in local social issues as well as their role in effectuating social planning goals.

A BIA functions as a municipal tool to facilitate economic development and, if social issues are increasingly perceived as integral to economic objectives as this report proposes, then
municipalities should consider whether or not BIAs are the proper institutional agents to augment the delivery of social services. The survey responses indicate BIAs typically have some level of involvement in social services (Metro Vancouver: $\bar{x} = 2.05$; VC: $\bar{x}_1 = 1.89$; OM: $\bar{x}_2 = 2.20$). Considering the perception of social issues as intertwined in economic objectives, however, BIAs with the means to do so are likely to migrate toward more involvement in social services over the course of time as opposed to less involvement. And, if BIAs are to become more prominent in social service provision in the future, municipalities must reflect on the democratic nature of BIAs and the manner in which they are accountable. BIAs clearly represent private business interests and are business-minded organizations that typically lack the expertise to extend their roles into social service areas. Thus, the primary BIA focus on economic objectives and revitalization efforts may at times align with municipal social policies and social planning goals, but, generally, BIA perspectives on social issues at the municipal level cannot be taken as representative of the population in the territories in which they operate. Accordingly, municipalities must work closely with BIAs to assure efforts to ameliorate social issues and establish social planning goals are aligned and in the best interests of the general public.

The proliferation of BIAs in BC over the last twenty years indicates BIAs are efficient and efficacious at facilitating economic development.¹⁸ Municipalities though should also consider how “mission creep” affects the original mandates of the BIAs they authorize. Mission creep, as noted by one BIA Executive Director, is the notion that BIA missions or strategic plans tend to evolve over time as various board and committee members exert their influence on the BIA’s directives, whether these directives are social or economic in nature. More specifically, the tendency of mission creep is to expand BIA strategic plans in a more integrative direction that recognizes the complex interrelationship between social and economic objectives. In this case municipalities, it should be stated, are best served as BIAs function as more comprehensive entities that organize business interests, support revitalization initiatives, and align policy advocacy positions in the private sector. Furthermore, BIAs are uniquely positioned to play an important intermediary role among the three sectors of the economy. Municipalities recognizing this unique position of BIAs ultimately gain a competitive advantage in the competition with

¹⁸ According to Business Improvement Areas of British Columbia—an umbrella organization representing most of the BIAs in the province—there are 58 BIAs in BC. This statistic does not include the three BIAs currently in the planning stages within Metro Vancouver.
other BC municipalities for limited provincial government funding. In other words, if the squeaky wheel indeed gets the grease then municipalities that foster BIAs as integrative and comprehensive development tools are poised to gain more from provincial funding arrangements.

3. The Province of British Columbia should enable BIAs to evolve toward becoming tools of social innovation.

A comprehensive finding from the analysis of the survey data is that there is no one-size-fits-all BIA tool. BIAs have different objectives depending on the unique social and economic characteristics of the territory in which they operate. BIAs tend to strategically prioritize service areas based on these and other characteristics and choose to be involved in the service areas that best serve their members and objectives. The analysis of the survey responses outlined how VC and OM BIAs differ, particularly in terms of their views on the level of social service delivery in their territories, their perception of social issues as relevant to the management of the organization, and the general socioeconomic levels of the areas in which they are located. To put it differently, the individual survey responses demonstrated that BIAs are each involved in a unique array of service areas and to varying degrees, too. Just as no one BIA addresses every social issue, BIAs formulate strategies to facilitate the change they envision for their territories. Consequently the BIA tool is required to be as adaptive as possible in order to respond to the unique social and economic characteristics of the area.

In addition, Hernandez and Jones (2008) describe the BIA sphere of influence as local and limited, but note that BIAs often encounter “forces of change” that are beyond their control and are connected to broader issues. “These can include downturns in the regional or local economies, systemic shifts in commercial structures, new forms of competition, alterations in the transport system, changes in tourist behaviours, and fundamental demographic shifts” (p. 417). As it stands, the BIA model is based on partnerships among property owners, business owners, and municipal councils, but BIAs need to develop more complex partnerships in order to overcome the broader issues that now pervade their areas and affect their strategic visions.

The Province of British Columbia is in the position to enact legislation that would enable late stage BIAs to evolve into tools for social innovation in addition to their economic development
roles. Late stage BIAs describe the organizations that conduct what Hoyt (2008) refers to as Tier III activities, namely this includes an involvement in social services and established monitoring and evaluation processes. Currently, both the Community Charter and the Vancouver Charter dictate that municipal councils may only grant money to BIAs that adhere to a “business promotion scheme.” The conditions of the business promotion scheme do not consider the intervolvement of social issues with economic objectives. A shift toward a network governance paradigm, however, would open the door for co-leadership opportunities among the private and voluntary sectors in collaboration with the public sector and offer the most flexible model to structure the future direction of BIAs in BC. This vision of the future of BIAs also incorporates the notion that the integration of social and economic objectives is complex and the partnerships that are required to ameliorate social issues and facilitate economic development need to mirror this complexity. Literature on the emerging roles of BIAs (Gopal-Agge & Hoyt, 2008; Hernandez & Jones, 2008; Hoyt, 2007; Morcol & Patrick, 2008; Morcol & Zimmerman, 2008) points to new forms of governance that would enable BIAs to expand their reach in order to affect social outcomes in the community and build the capacity to address social issues more readily. Ultimately, this vision for BIAs in the future recognizes the unique position of BIAs in the community and among the various sectors of the economy and sees potential for BIAs as a form of social innovation.

All in all, BIAs in Metro Vancouver certainly perceive social issues as intervolved in economic objectives and there are differences noted between VC and OM BIAs with respect to the perception of and response to social issues. The differences noted among BIAs in each strata suggest it is likely that municipal social policies have some affect on the economic objectives of BIAs. Whether municipal social policies are the primary factors that cause these differences is interesting to consider. Yet to draw any significant conclusions about the impact municipal social policies have on the economic objectives of BIAs would necessitates a more in-depth case study analysis. Future research could evaluate the implications of municipal polices on the actions of

---

19 In January 2011 the provincial government announced the creation of the Advisory Council on Social Entrepreneurship and established the Assistant Deputy Minister's Committee on Social Entrepreneurship. The Advisory Council on Social Entrepreneurship is comprised of representatives from the public, private, and voluntary sectors, including academia. Together these initiatives signal the emergence of social innovation in the mainstream milieu and the recognition of the value of cross-sectoral partnerships in addressing complex social and economic issues (see: BC Government Caucus, 2011).

20 As previously noted, the Vancouver Charter governs the formation of VC BIAs and the Community Charter governs BIA in the rest of the province, including OM BIAs.
BIAs and—as this research project demonstrates—the municipalities of the Metro Vancouver region certainly represent a unique opportunity for such an inquiry.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Metro Vancouver BIA Population List*

City of Vancouver BIAs – Vancouver City (VC) 20 BIAs

Cambie Village BIA (2006)  
Rania Hatz, Executive Director  
3378 Cambie Street  
Vancouver, BC V5Z 2W5  
T: 604.710.2954  
rania.hatz@gmail.com  
www.cambievillage.com

Robson Street BIA (1991)  
Tomarra Walker, Executive Director  
412 - 1155 Robson Street  
Vancouver, BC V6E 1B5  
T: 604.669.8132  
info@robinsonstreet.ca  
www.robinsonstreet.ca

Chinatown BIA (2000)  
Diamond Liu, Executive Manager  
508 Taylor Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 6M4  
T: 604.632.3808  
vcbia@vancouver-chinatown.com  
www.vancouver-chinatown.com

South Granville BIA (1999)  
Sharon Townsend, Executive Director  
210 - 1501 West Broadway  
Vancouver, BC V6J 4Z6  
T: 604.734.3195  
info@southgranville.org  
www.southgranville.org

Downtown Vancouver BIA (1990)  
Charles Gauthier, Executive Director  
1790 - 401 West Georgia Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 5A1  
T: 604.685.7811  
charles@downtownvancouver.net  
www.downtownvancouver.net

Strathcona BIA (2000)  
Joji Kumagai, Acting Executive Director  
1220 East Hastings Street  
Vancouver, BC V6A 1S6  
T: 604.258.2727  
strathconabia@telus.net  
www.strathconabia.com

Gastown BIA (1989)  
Leanore Sali, Executive Director  
145 - 332 Water Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 1B6  
T: 604.683.5650  
info@gastown.org  
www.gastown.org

West End BIA (1999)  
Lyn Hellyar, Executive Director  
411 - 1033 Davie Street  
Vancouver, BC V6E 1M7  
T: 604.696.0144  
lyn.hellyar@westendbia.com  
www.westendbia.com

Kitsilano – Fourth Avenue BIA (2001)  
Russ Davies, Manager  
202 - 1857 West 4th Avenue  
Vancouver, BC V6J 1M4  
T: 604.263.6443  
info@kitsilano4thavenue.com  
www.kitsilano4thavenue.com

Yaletown BIA (1999)  
Annette O’Shea, Executive Director  
3 - 1290 Homer Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 2Y5  
T: 604.683.7473  
execdir@yaletowninfo.com  
www.yaletowninfo.com

* This is an updated list originally derived from: http://vancouver.ca/commsvcs/cityplans/bia/contacts.htm#metro
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Improvement Association (BIA)</th>
<th>Executive Director/Coordinator</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant BIA (1989)</td>
<td>Lynn Warwick, Executive Director</td>
<td>301 - 3102 Main Street</td>
<td>604.874.9816</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpbia@telus.net">mpbia@telus.net</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.mountpleasantbia.com">www.mountpleasantbia.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings North BIA (2001)</td>
<td>Patricia Barnes, Executive Director</td>
<td>2620 East Hastings Street</td>
<td>604.215.2401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hastingsnorthbia@telus.net">hastingsnorthbia@telus.net</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.hastingssunrise.ca">www.hastingssunrise.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood BIA (2001)</td>
<td>Diana Cousins, Manager</td>
<td>300 - 3665 Kingsway</td>
<td>604.639.4403</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@shopcollingwood.ca">info@shopcollingwood.ca</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.shopcollingwood.ca">www.shopcollingwood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrisdale BIA (1991)</td>
<td>Terri Clark, Coordinator</td>
<td>P.O. Box 18068</td>
<td>604.266.9875</td>
<td><a href="mailto:webmaster@kerrisdalevillage.com">webmaster@kerrisdalevillage.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.kerrisdalevillage.com">www.kerrisdalevillage.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Drive BIA (2000)</td>
<td>Michelle Barile, Executive Director</td>
<td>4 - 1726 Commercial Drive</td>
<td>604.251.2884</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@thedrive.ca">info@thedrive.ca</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.thedrive.ca">www.thedrive.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marpole BIA (2000)</td>
<td>Claudia Laroye, Executive Director</td>
<td>201 - 8623 Granville Street</td>
<td>604.418.8232</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marpolebia@marpoleonline.com">marpolebia@marpoleonline.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.marpoleonline.com">www.marpoleonline.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Village BIA (2008)</td>
<td>Janet Morris-Reade, Executive Director</td>
<td>PO Box 45072, 4326 Dunbar Street</td>
<td>604.692.2885</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@dunbarvillage.ca">info@dunbarvillage.ca</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dunbarvillage.ca">www.dunbarvillage.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Grey Village BIA (2004)</td>
<td>Russ Davies, Manager</td>
<td>162 - 4438 West 10th Avenue</td>
<td>604.263.6443</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@pointgreyvillage.com">info@pointgreyvillage.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.pointgreyvillage.com">www.pointgreyvillage.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Street BIA (2007)</td>
<td>Aila Karpio, Executive Director</td>
<td>465 - 6362 Fraser Street</td>
<td>778.385.7242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@southhillbia.ca">info@southhillbia.ca</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.southhillbia.ca">www.southhillbia.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Drive BIA (2004)</td>
<td>Po-wah Ng, Coordinator</td>
<td>c/o South Vancouver Neighbourhood House</td>
<td>604.318.9972</td>
<td><a href="mailto:powah_ng@yahoo.ca">powah_ng@yahoo.ca</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vicdrive.com">www.vicdrive.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suburban BIAs – Outer Municipalities (OM) 12 BIAs

Austin Heights BIA
Erin Davidson, Executive Director
P.O. Box 1035-1029 Ridgeway Avenue
Coquitlam, BC V3J 6Z9
T: 604.765.2055
info@austinheights.ca
www.austinheights.ca

Burnaby North Road BIA
Carolyn Orazietti, Executive Director
9912 Lougheed Hwy
Burnaby, BC V3J 1N3
T: 604.415.4779
info@burnabynorthroadbia.ca
www.burnabynorthroadbia.ca

Cloverdale BIA
Paul Orazietti, Executive Director
202 - 17687 56A Avenue
Surrey, BC V3S 1G4
T: 604.576.3155
cloverdalebia@telus.net
www.cloverdalebia.com

Downtown Langley BIA
Teri James, Executive Director
201 - 20559 Fraser Highway
Langley, BC V3A 4G3
T: 604.539.0133
info@downtownlangley.com
www.downtownlangley.com

Downtown Maple Ridge BIA
Ineke Boekhorst, Executive Director
PO Box 530
#34 - 22374 Lougheed Hwy
V2X 2T5
T: 604.467.2420
inekeb@downtownmapleridge.ca
www.downtownmapleridge.ca

Downtown Surrey BIA
Elizabeth Model, Executive Director
300 - 10524 King George Boulevard
Surrey, BC V3T 2X2
T: 604.580.2321
elizabeth@downtownsurreybia.com
www.downtownsurreybia.com

Downtown Langley BIA
Elizabeth Model, Executive Director
300 - 10524 King George Boulevard
Surrey, BC V3T 2X2
T: 604.580.2321
elizabeth@downtownsurreybia.com
www.downtownsurreybia.com

Downtown Langley BIA
Teri James, Executive Director
201 - 20559 Fraser Highway
Langley, BC V3A 4G3
T: 604.539.0133
info@downtownlangley.com
www.downtownlangley.com

Downtown Maple Ridge BIA
Ineke Boekhorst, Executive Director
PO Box 530
#34 - 22374 Lougheed Hwy
V2X 2T5
T: 604.467.2420
inekeb@downtownmapleridge.ca
www.downtownmapleridge.ca

Heights Merchants Association BIA
Isabel Kolic, Executive Director
4019 Hastings Street
Burnaby, BC V5C 2J1
T: 604.294.9060
isabel@burnabyheights.com
www.burnabyheights.com

Fort Langley BIA
Kristina Gervais, Coordinator
PO Box 198
Fort Langley, BC V1M 2R5
T: 604.888.8835
bia@fortlangley.com
www.fortlangley.com

Heights Merchants Association BIA
Isabel Kolic, Executive Director
4019 Hastings Street
Burnaby, BC V5C 2J1
T: 604.294.9060
isabel@burnabyheights.com
www.burnabyheights.com

Fort Langley BIA
Kristina Gervais, Coordinator
PO Box 198
Fort Langley, BC V1M 2R5
T: 604.888.8835
bia@fortlangley.com
www.fortlangley.com

Port Coquitlam BIA
Kayla Steele, Office Administrator
2 - 2559 Shaughnessy Street
Port Coquitlam, BC V3C 3G3
T: 604.464.1490
info@pocobia.com
www.pocobia.com

Tsawwassen BIA
Ana Arciniega, Executive Director
1333 56th Street
Delta, BC V4L 2A6
T: 604.943.0502
biaoffice@shoptsawwassen.com
www.shoptsawwassen.com
Downtown New Westminster BIA
William Shannon, Ed. D.
100 - 713 Columbia Street
New Westminster, BC V3M 1B2
T: 604.524.4996
info@downtownnewwest.ca
http://downtownnewwest.ca

White Rock BIA
Cyndie Richards, Executive Director
1524 Foster Street
Central Plaza
White Rock, BC V4B 3X8
T: 604.536.4958
info@whiterockbia.com
www.stayplaywhiterock.com

Note: At the time of researching and writing this report there were currently three BIAs in various stages of approval within Metro Vancouver: Hastings Crossing BIA and West Broadway BIA in the City of Vancouver and the Lower Lonsdale BIA in North Vancouver.
### Appendix B – Survey Instrument

**School of Urban and Regional Planning**

**SURVEY of BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREAS in METRO VANCOUVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Background</th>
<th>Name of BIA</th>
<th>Completed surveys may be submitted electronically by selecting email button below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In what year was your organization legally established?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you served in your current position? (in months)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which best describes the group(s) responsible for forming the organization? (choose one)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which of the following describe the original reason(s) for creating the business improvement association? (choose all that apply)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) To establish stability in funding</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>d) To encourage development of new business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To implement revitalization efforts</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>e) To market the area and attract customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To deal with encroaching social issues</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>f) To maintain shopping alternatives (to mall, big box, factory outlets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Structure and Scope**

| Currently, your organization has how many full-time employees? | [ ] | |
| Currently, your organization has how many part-time employees? | [ ] | |
| How many members serve on your governing board? | [ ] | |
| Approximately how many properties are located in the business improvement area? | [ ] | |
| What is your organization's approximate annual budget? (enter numbers only, no punctuation or spaces) | [ ] | |

10. Please indicate the degree to which your organization is involved in the following services: (select one for each of the 8 service areas listed below) **(Very involved | Somewhat involved | Not at all involved)**

| Capital improvements (installing pedestrian-scale lighting & street furniture, planting trees & shrubbery) | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
### 10.2 Consumer marketing
- Producing festivals & events, coordinating sales promotions, producing maps, brochures & newsletters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.3 Economic development
- Fostering new business or expanding existing ones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.4 Maintenance
- Collecting trash, removing litter & graffiti, washing sidewalks, shovelling snow, trimming trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.5 Public space regulation
- Managing sidewalk vending, discouraging panhandling, controlling vehicle loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.6 Policy advocacy
- Promoting public policies to community, lobbying government on behalf of business interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.7 Security
- Providing supplementary security guards, installing security systems, working with city police force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.8 Social services
- Aiding the homeless, providing job training, supplying youth services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Involved</th>
<th>Somewhat Involved</th>
<th>Not at all Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Issues

11. To what extent do you consider the following as social issues relevant to your management of a business improvement area?
- Select one for each of the 12 social issues listed below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Somewhat Significant</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.1 Unemployment

11.2 Adult literacy

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.3 Homelessness</th>
<th>Very significant</th>
<th>Somewhat significant</th>
<th>Not significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.4 Panhandling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 Vandalism, including graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 Property theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 Substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8 Drug dealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9 Prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10 Gang violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11 Squeegee kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12 Street vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Referring to those social issues you consider very significant from your responses in the previous question, briefly describe any specific programs, services, or advocacy that your organization undertakes (form accepts multiple entries; separate listed items with semi colon). e.g.:  

12.6 Property theft Downtown on Call program provides security, safety and hospitality services; Downtown Watch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.1 Unemployment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.2 Adult literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 Panhandling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 Vandalism, including graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6 Property theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7 Substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8 Drug dealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9 Prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10 Gang violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11 Squeegee kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12 Street vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Based on the number of complaints or concerns from BIA members, please rank the five most persistent social issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>No persistent issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. How does your organization prioritize social issues that are deemed actionable? (choose all that apply)

- a) Priorities identified in a general meeting
- b) Decisions made by board of directors
- c) Based on committee recommendations
- d) Based on strategic plan
- e) Other
- f) If other, please specify

15. What factors limit your organization’s role in planning for social issues? (choose all that apply)

- a) Budget limitations
- b) Not enough staff/time
- c) Not in mandate
- d) Other agencies already deal with social issues
- e) Board member directives
- f) Limitations imposed by municipality
- g) Other
- h) If other, please specify

16. In your opinion, which of the following best describes the level of social service delivery in your organization's territory?

- a) Very high
  (Social service providers are clearly more highly concentrated within the BIA when compared to other areas)
- b) High
  (There are a lot of social service providers when compared to nearby areas)
- c) Average
  (The level of social service provision is about comparable to other nearby areas)
- d) Low
  (There are fewer social service providers operating in the BIA than in nearby areas)
- e) Don’t know
  (I am not aware of any social service providers operating in the BIA)

17. Which phrase best describes how your BIA views social issues as they relate to the economic objectives of the organization?

| [ ] |

**Evolution**

18. Which phrase best describes the change in the physical territory of the BIA since its inception?

| [ ] |

19. Which of the following best describes how the organization's central mission has changed since its inception?

| [ ] |

20. In your opinion, which of the following best describes the future role for your organization with respect to social planning advocacy?

| [ ] |

Continued next page
Note: The survey was conducted electronically and the original survey instrument is a PDF file. As a result, the dropdown menus on the survey instrument are not displayed here. For an electronic copy of the survey, please contact the author at: darin.schaal@queensu.ca
Appendix C – Sample Contact Email

Dear Sir and/or Madame,

My name is Darin Schaal. I am a graduate student in the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University. I am conducting research that will contribute to my master’s report.

The research project examines how BIAs in Metro Vancouver perceive social issues as integral to economic objectives. Your business improvement area can contribute to this research project by completing and submitting a short electronic survey. The survey includes 20 questions and is attached as a PDF document to this email.

For research consistency, it is important that the Executive Director complete the short survey.

For more information about the research project, please see the Letter of Information below or contact the researcher directly: darin.schaal@queensu.ca (613)331-2132.

Thank you for participating in the research project and I look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Darin Schaal
M.Pl Candidate 2011
Queen's University, School of Urban and Regional Planning
Letter of Information

Business Improvement Areas in Metro Vancouver: The Convergence of Economic Development and Social Responsibility

This research is being conducted by Darin Schaal, Queen’s University, School of Urban and Regional Planning. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's University policies.

What is this study about? The purpose of this research is to contribute to research informing the role of business improvement associations and their perception of social issues as factors in economic development.

The study will require your participation by completing and submitting a short electronic survey. Your involvement will assist the student researcher to write a master’s report on this subject. There are no known physical, psychological, economic, or social risks associated with this study.

Is my participation voluntary? Yes. Although it would be greatly appreciated if you would answer all survey questions as frankly as possible, you should not feel obliged to answer any material that you find objectionable or that makes you feel uncomfortable. You may also withdraw from the research project at any time. Should you choose to withdraw from the research project, please inform the researcher: Darin Schaal, darin.schaal@queensu.ca or 613-331-2132.

What will happen to my responses? The data collected may be published in professional journals or presented at academic or professional planning conferences, but any such presentation will be of general findings and will never breach individual confidentiality of any survey participant. Should you be interested, you are entitled to a copy of the final report.

What if I have concerns? In the event that you have any complaints, concerns or questions about this research, please feel free to contact the interviewer directly or the research supervisor, Dr. John Meligrana, john.meligrana@queensu.ca (613-533-6000 ext. 77145). If your concerns relate to the ethical nature of this research project, you may also direct your questions to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board (603-533-6081) at Queen’s University.

Thank you. Your participation in this research project is greatly appreciated.
Appendix D – Circle File Latitudes and Longitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIA Name</th>
<th>Latitude °N</th>
<th>Longitude °W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Vancouver BIA</td>
<td>49.28247</td>
<td>123.11816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End BIA</td>
<td>49.28916</td>
<td>123.13856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Chinatown BIA</td>
<td>49.27959</td>
<td>123.09984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Granville BIA</td>
<td>49.26233</td>
<td>123.13865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings North BIA</td>
<td>49.28121</td>
<td>123.06099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant BIA</td>
<td>49.26118</td>
<td>123.10094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marpole BIA</td>
<td>49.21057</td>
<td>123.14043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill (Fraser Street) BIA</td>
<td>49.22879</td>
<td>123.09062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood BIA</td>
<td>49.23274</td>
<td>123.03322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Surrey BIA</td>
<td>49.19167</td>
<td>122.84521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Heights BIA</td>
<td>49.24922</td>
<td>122.86385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsawwassen BIA</td>
<td>49.02480</td>
<td>123.06862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heights Merchants BIA</td>
<td>49.28105</td>
<td>123.00990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Langley BIA</td>
<td>49.16946</td>
<td>122.57606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown New Westminster BIA</td>
<td>49.20455</td>
<td>122.90543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Maple Ridge BIA</td>
<td>49.21892</td>
<td>122.59631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Langley BIA</td>
<td>49.10495</td>
<td>122.65595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale BIA</td>
<td>49.10717</td>
<td>122.73493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby North Road BIA</td>
<td>49.24604</td>
<td>122.89266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>